

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

THE JOHN M. KREBS DONATION

Division. BS2795

Section. D372

copy 2



A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

SECOND EPISTLE

OF

THE APOSTLE PETER.

BY

JOHN T. DEMAREST, D. D.,

MINISTER OF THE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH, PASCACK, N. J.

NEW YORK :

A. LLOYD, 115 NASSAU STREET.

1865.

BERGEN & TRIPP, PRINTERS,
103 Fulton St., N. Y.

P R E F A C E .

Our commentary on the second epistle of Peter is chiefly exegetical, or designed to explain what we conceive to be the true meaning of the Apostle; or rather, what the Holy Spirit signifies by him. There are but few commentaries of this kind on this portion of scripture extant in our language; and the one here offered to the Christian reader is the fruit of years of labor. Those who take pleasure in searching the Scriptures, because they testify of Christ and of eternal life in him, should not be deterred from perusing an exposition of this sort, even if entirely unacquainted with the Greek language; for we have studied so to give the explanation, as to make it intelligible to the mere English reader, as well as to others. And when quotations from any author are given in Latin or Greek, they are in almost every instance translated, or the substance of them stated in our language.

The author hopes that his work will be of some use to his brethren in the ministry; though he does not expect them to agree with him in all things: all that he can say is, that he has honestly endeavored to ascertain the meaning of this part of Holy Scripture, and to state it with clearness and brevity. The introduction is more protracted than we had originally intended, but the importance of the enquiry with respect to the authenticity of the

Epistle, and the efforts made by modern critics to brand it as spurious, must be our apology.

The translation of the epistle is an essential part of the interpretation, and if justice is done us herein, it must be viewed in that light. It is accordingly sometimes slavishly literal, inelegant and bald, corresponding more to the Greek than to the English idiom; oftener, however, it is more in accordance with the laws of our tongue. It has been made, therefore, *not* to show what an English version should be; *not* to disparage the translation in common use; but, in connection with the explanations, to give more easily our own view of the exact meaning of the original text. Since this is alone authentic and inspired, a Commentator has a perfect right to take his own way of eliciting the sense of the original. Nor does the mode which we have adopted tend to lessen the esteem which unlearned Christians should feel towards the excellent version of this Epistle in common use; which will be evident to all who compare them.

The Expositors to whom we are especially indebted for assistance are repeatedly mentioned in the commentary. The citations, or translations from *Calvin* are taken from the Amsterdam edition of his works. *Benson's* "Paraphrase and Notes on the Seven Catholic Epistles," London edition, 1749. *McKnight* on the Apostolical Epistles, Philadelphia edition, 1835. Our occasional references to *Beza* are from the following work: *Jesu Christi D. N. Novum Testamentum Theodoro Beza interprete. Additæ sunt summæ breves doctrinæ in Evangelistas, et Acta Apostolorum, item, Methodus Apostolicarum Epistolarum ab eodem autore, eum brevi phraseon, et locorum difficiliorum expositione, ex ipsius autoris majoribus annotationibus desumpta, paucis etiam additis ex Joach. Camerarii notationibus in Evangelistas et Acta:* by P. Loselerius Villerius. London, 1574. It has been out of our power to consult the Cambridge edition of 1642.

If, in any instance, then, we have done injustice to *Beza*, the cause of it is explained. *Bengel's* *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*,

third edition, by M. E. Bengel and Stendel. Tubingen, 1835 and 1836. *Thomas Smith*: Commentarius, etc., in his Miscellanea, London, 1690.

The following editions of the Greek Testament have been constantly consulted :

Hahn, by Professor Robinson.

Bloomfield, Philadelphia, 1844.

Griesbach, edition of 1805.

Lachmann's larger edition. Berlin, vol. I, 1842, vol. II, 1850.

Tischendorf's Editio Septima Critica Major, published by Winter, Leipsic, 1859.

We have also constantly examined Tyndale's New Testament, edition of 1526; the Vulgate, and particularly as found in Lachmann's work, above mentioned; also the translation of the Syriac New Testament by Murdock, though we have not cited it as an authority unless confirmed by Tischendorf.

Some various readings have been given, chiefly to demonstrate how trifling and unimportant most of them are, and on what a solid foundation the integrity and uncorrupted preservation of the New Testament rest. The authorities for and against the various readings, have been taken from the editions of Lachmann and Tischendorf by a careful collation. If there are any mistakes arising from oversight in this particular, they can easily be corrected by a reference to them. Tischendorf gives the authorities most accurately and fully. He has examined the uncial manuscripts with great care and diligence, and constantly refers to them; also, to the cursive manuscripts, and versions, and to the ancient ecclesiastical writers or fathers. In his introduction, besides other interesting topics, he gives an admirable catalogue and description of the uncial manuscripts; a catalogue also of the cursive ones, and explanations as to the editions of the Fathers used by him.

The *uncial* manuscripts, containing the Catholic Epistles, are comparatively few, and for the sake of those who may not have

a critical edition of the New Testament in their possession, we will mention them : (the *cursive*, about 200.)

- A. *The Alexandrine Manuscript* of the 6th century. It contains the Old and New Testaments nearly complete. The Catholic Epistles, as found in this manuscript, are complete.
- B. *The Vatican Manuscript* of the 4th century. It contains the Catholic Epistles complete, and the Old and New Testaments nearly so.
- C. *Codex rescriptus S. Ephraemi* of the 5th century. As to the Catholic Epistles, there are some deficiencies.
- G. *Codex bibliothecæ Angelicæ*, (of the Augustines at Rome,) or *Codex Passionei*, formerly belonging to Cardinal Passione. It is of the 9th Century, and contains the text of the Acts, Pauline and Catholic Epistles. As to the latter, nothing is wanting.
- K. *Codex Mosquensis S. Synodi* Nr xeviii, ex monasterio S. Dionysii in monte Atho. Matthæio dicitur codex g. Scholzio cod. 102. It seem to be of the 9th century, and contains the Catholic Epistles complete, adjuncta catena patrum, (Tischendorf, Compare Hahn's New Testament by Robinson, and Hug's Introduction to New Testament by Fosdick.)

To avoid tedious and needless circumlocution, we have generally given our explanations in an unequivocal and decided manner; but by so doing, we have never intended them to be dogmatical. Where the phrase, "in our judgment," is not expressed, the reader will have the goodness to suppose it understood, or implied. If any should not be satisfied with this, then we commend to their attention a few words from a sensible heathen poet :

Naturam expellās furca, tamen usque recurret.

PASCACK, BERGEN CO., N. J., JAN. 16th, 1862.

INTRODUCTION.

I. AN INQUIRY INTO THE GENUINENESS OR AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE.

§ 1. *Preliminary remarks concerning the books of the New Testament called, Controverted, by Eusebius.*

EUSEBIUS, of Cæsarea, published his Ecclesiastical History* about A. D. 312. He has done good service for the church in preserving many extracts from ancient writers in reference to the books of the New Testament. His learning in this department is unquestionable, and far superior to his judgment and critical acumen, in which he is somewhat deficient. This author makes the following classification of the books of the New Testament : *First, writings universally received* as genuine, or those which he found cited by ecclesiastical authors, from the first century to his day, as undoubtedly the productions of Apostles, or Apostolic men, i. e. the companions and disciples of Apostles. These books are the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John ; the Acts of the Apostles, and thirteen Epistles of Paul ; also the first Epistle of John, and the first Epistle of Peter. In the *second* class, or *those controverted by some, although well known and approved*

* An English version of this history by C. F. Cruicé, has been published.

by most ecclesiastical authors as genuine, are the following : The Epistles of James and of Jude, the second Epistle of Peter, and the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation.*

The *third* class mentioned by him comprises books that claimed to be apostolic, but were *universally rejected as spurious*. These writings were forged and published in the name of Apostles, but they were miserable compilations, and entirely destitute of authority, inasmuch as they were not cited by any ancient church-writers as apostolic productions ; such were ‘the Acts of Peter,’ ‘the Gospel according to Peter,’ etc.

Augustine, Athanasius, Jerome and Rufinus, in the catalogues they give of the New Testament, regard as unimportant this classification made by Eusebius. Indeed, in the latter part of the fourth century, the books of the New Testament now universally received by the Protestant churches, were then also received by the church in general. The reason of this remarkable agreement of opinion as to the canon of the New Testament is, most likely, to be found in the fact, that the doubts of some as to the so-called controverted books (so honestly stated by the father of church history) were discovered, after a thorough examination into the historical evidence, to rest on no solid foundation.

As to the principles by which the ancients were guided in deciding on the genuineness of any writing claiming to be apostolic, they were beyond all doubt, in the main, correct and sound. Before a writing, professing to be composed by an Apostle, could be publicly read in the churches as a part of Holy Scripture, the fact that it was so written, was established by *external* or *historical evidence* ; that is, by undoubted quotations of such writing as apostolic, by church writers from the first century to their day. Besides this external evidence, they examined also

* Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. book 3, chaps. 3 and 25,) does not distinctly place the Revelation and the epistle to the Hebrews among the controverted books ; though he often mentions the doubts some entertained concerning their authors.

the *internal*. They brought a work professing to be apostolic to the touchstone of other writings universally acknowledged to be from the Apostles, in order to see whether the same great leading truths were maintained by both. They also examined in the same way the style of the so-called controverted books. But in this last particular, both ancient and modern writers in the church have been much too dogmatic, and often most mistaken, when most positive in the expression of their opinions.

With respect to the circumstances which led some to doubt of the genuineness of the controverted books, they were the following: (1.) Doubts arose as to the question whether certain of these books were written by Apostles, or by others of the same name. This applies particularly to the epistles of James and of Jude, and to the second and third epistles of John. Accordingly, Eusebius, after mentioning 2d and 3d John, adds, "whether they are of the evangelist, or of some other of the same name." (2.) Doubts arose in the minds of some as to the epistle of Jude in particular, owing to the fact, real or alleged, that he quoted from apocryphal authors. (3.) Others doubted of some of these books from pre-conceived opinions, or doctrinal prejudice; paying little or no attention to the historical evidence in their favor; a way of procedure altogether unsound, and a fruitful source of error to critics even to this day. Matters of fact must not be settled by our philosophy or divinity, but by historical evidence. It was this doctrinal prejudice that led some to doubt of the Revelation, as John's. Their pre-conceived opinions concerning the millennium, blinded their eyes as to the force and importance of the very ancient and unequivocal testimonies in favor of its genuineness. (4.) Doubts also arose as to the apostolic origin of some of these books from a difference of style, real or supposed, when compared with other writings of the same apostle, universally admitted to be genuine. Hence some were led to doubt whether Paul was the author of the epistle of the Hebrews, and whether Peter was

the author of the second epistle ascribed to him, and claiming to be his.

The question now naturally arises, what importance should be attached to doubts as to these books, thus originated? Are they sufficient to justify us in rejecting these books as spurious? In our judgment they are not. (1.) Neither did Eusebius himself in all instances deem them so. He undoubtedly, for example, received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's. Hence he says, giving his own judgment, "The epistles of Paul are fourteen, all well known and beyond doubt." (Book 3, chap. 3.) (2.) The books called by him controverted, were not without strong historical evidence in their favor, but they had not that full evidence as those called by him 'universally received.' The evidence was the same in kind; it only differed in amount and degree; or, *more* ancient writers had testified to the genuineness of the one class than to the other. This is manifest from his own expressions. For, speaking of the controverted books, he says, "Among the controverted books, *although they are well known and approved by many,*" etc. And again, "The controverted, although they are recognized (i. e. as genuine) *by most ecclesiastical writers.*" (Book 3, chap. 25.) Here is his testimony to the fact that these books were quoted as genuine by most of the old church writers; and his testimony is of great value, since, as is well known, he had a large and precious library to consult. (3.) We are inclined to suspect that those persons in the Anti-Nicene church who hesitated about the authenticity of the so-called controverted books, made an improper use of a right distinction between apostles strictly so called, and apostolical men. Hence, Origen contended that God only could tell who wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, i. e. as to its Greek style and construction; though he unhesitatingly admitted that the thoughts or doctrines contained therein were Pauline. Now, if Paul gave all the leading thoughts, and Luke or Apollos shaped the Greek expressions and construction, the apostle himself would, of course review the whole, and send

it to those addressed, stamped, with his own approbation; and such an epistle would be indeed Paul's, or he only would be its proper author. Again, if the epistle of Jude be not a composition of the apostle Jude, it should not for that reason be thrown out of the number of inspired books. He calls himself "a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." No one can prove that this brother of James was not 'a leading man among the brethren,' and 'a prophet,' or inspired person; if any will have it that he was not an apostle, in the strict sense, still he was an apostolic man, a companion and disciple of apostles, a prophet or evangelist; and inspiration was not a gift of the Holy Spirit confined to apostles alone. Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists were all inspired, though the apostles received the Spirit in larger measure, and were first also in rank or authority. (Compare 1 Cor. 12: 28-30 with 8-11 vs. Eph. 4: 11 and 3, 5.) (4.) There is nothing in any of these books repugnant to the apostolic doctrine as stated in the books 'universally received'; but, on the contrary, they fully agree with them in the great leading truths. Thus it appears, not only that the internal evidence is on their side, but also that the external evidence is in favor of their authenticity, even according to the testimony of Eusebius himself.

§ 2. *Historical evidence with respect to the genuineness of the Epistle.*

The question is, whether this second epistle was truly written by the apostle Peter, the author of the first. The writer of the second epistle declares it in a way that cannot be misunderstood. 2 Pet. 1: 1, and 3: 1; comp. 2 Pet. 1: 16-18. We must therefore either receive this epistle as Peter's, or reject it as a forgery. Let us therefore call ancient witnesses before us, and listen with an unprejudiced mind to their testimony.

CLEMENT OF ROME, A. D. 70, or 96.

This author wrote an epistle to the church of Corinth, in the name of the church of Rome, in order to quell the dissensions and party spirit then raging among the Corinthians. In it he cites by name Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, and alludes to other parts of the New Testament, generally however without any marks of quotation; and often he alludes to the thought more than to the words.

Thus he seems to allude to the second epistle of Peter. (VII. *) "*Noah preached repentance, and they who hearkened were saved.*" (IX.) "*Noah—by his ministry preached regeneration to the world.*" With which 2 Pet. 2: 5, must be compared: "He saved" (guarded, or safely kept) "*Noah, one of eight, a preacher of righteousness.*" Some, with a magisterial air, assert that Clement simply alludes to the Old Testament, as Davidson† and others. But where in the book of Genesis, or in any part of the Holy Scripture, is Noah spoken of in the character of *a preacher*? The preaching of Noah is mentioned in Scripture only in 2 Pet. 2: 5. The writer of 2 Peter says that Noah and seven others were saved: Clement, that they who hearkened unto Noah were saved; by which he means the family of Noah, considering them as persons who believed the prophecy concerning the coming flood. They, also, both call Noah a preacher to the Antediluvians; but this preaching is mentioned only in this second epistle. These coincidences are striking: the words of Clement therefore seem to be a manifest allusion to 2 Pet. 2: 5; and, if so, they are a proof that Clement and the church of Rome received this epistle as a genuine epistle of Peter, and that, too, before the close of the first century.

(XI.) Clement says, "Because of his hospitality and piety Lot was saved out of Sodom, when all the surrounding region *was condemned by fire and brimstone; the Lord making it very manifest*

* We use Hefele's *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, 3rd edition.

† Introduction to New Testament, vol. III.

that he forsakes not those who hope in him ; and on the other hand, that those who turn aside he appoints to punishment and torment."

2 Pet. 2 : 6, 7, 9. "And consuming the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, he *condemned* with an overthrow, *making them an ensample to those who should live in impiety.* But delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked. *The Lord knows how to deliver the pious out of trial, and to keep the unjust for the day of judgment to be punished."*

Clement here alludes to the second epistle of Peter, according to his usual way ; that is, he refers to the sentiment more than to the expression. Both writers not only mention the same facts, but they also draw the same inference from them with regard to God's sparing mercy towards the righteous, and his retributive justice towards the wicked. Clement's allusion may be to Gen. 18 : 23-25, but the form of his expressions makes it as probable that the second epistle of Peter is referred to.

It is best perhaps, to suppose the allusion to be both to the narrative in Genesis, and to the second chapter of this second epistle ; for Clement, immediately after the citation above given, speaks of Lot's wife as having an entirely different disposition from her husband, and of her signal punishment, and then adds : "In order that all may know, that they who are double-minded and distrustful of the power of God, are *for condemnation and for an ensample to all generations* : εἰς κρίμα καὶ εἰς σημείωσιν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται. In this clause there is a manifest allusion to 2 Pet. 2 : 6. Clement also seems to allude to 2 Pet. 1 : 9, (III.) where he speaks of each one of those addressed as forgetful of his christian duties and as *dim or short-sighted in his faith* : ἐν τῇ πιστεὶ ἀποθεῖς ἀμβλυσωπῆσαι.

(VIII.) "The ministers of the Grace of God spake by the Holy Spirit concerning repentance ; yea, even the Lord of all himself spake of repentance with an oath : As I live, saith the Lord, I will not the death of the sinner, as his repentance." Ezek. 33 : 11. In this chapter Clement also cites Isa. 1 : 16-20,

and then adds the following words: *Πάντας οὖν τοὺς ἀγαπητοὺς αὐτοῦ βουλόμενος μετανοίας μετασχεῖν, ἐστῆριξε τῷ παντοκρατοριζῶ, βουλῆματι αὐτοῦ, i. e.,* “He, therefore, by his almighty will confirmed it,” (that is, the great truth relating to his grace and mercy to those who repent, Ezek. 33 : 11,) “*willing that all his beloved partake of repentance.*”

2 Pet. 3 : 9. “The Lord is long-suffering *toward us, not willing that any perish, but that all come to repentance.*” Here the writer of this second epistle addresses “the beloved.” (8 v.) And does not Clement, in the clause italicised, allude to 2 Pet. 3 : 9, according to his usual method? Clement seems to have understood this portion of 2 Pet. as referring to the elect alone, and that their repentance was made certain by the gracious decree or will of the Almighty. This is on the supposition, that the participle used by Clement expresses a reason; and thus considered, the translation is as follows:—“He hath established it by his almighty will, inasmuch as he is willing that all his beloved partake of repentance.”

POLYCARP OF SMYRNA, ABOUT A. D. 108.

He wrote an epistle to the church of Philippi, which is everywhere tinged with expressions derived from various books of the New Testament. He makes an express reference to Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, and often quotes from the first Epistle of Peter, but there is no direct quotation from the second Epistle.

(III.) “I did not, brethren, take it on myself to write these things to you concerning righteousness; but ye yourselves have urged me thereto. For neither I, nor any one like me, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul, who, when he was among you, in the presence of the men then living, taught accurately and surely the word of truth, and who when absent, wrote you an epistle, or epistles,” (ὁμῶν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς.)* Here

* See Lardner's Credibility, &c., Part II., Chap. VI.

Polycarp disclaims all undue authority over those addressed ; he modestly, as a teacher of Christ's disciples, takes his proper place at the footstool of the apostle. He says that he, and others like him, can never attain to that *wisdom* which Paul exhibited. Now, what does Polycarp mean by *Paul's wisdom* as exhibited in this Epistle to the Philippians, and other Pauline epistles ? He refers to the fact that Paul was inspired by the Holy Ghost. "I am not inspired, neither are others like me ; and hence we cannot attain to the wisdom of Paul." Here, in our judgment, there is an allusion both to Eph. 3 : 4, "*My understanding in the mystery of Christ ;*" and to 2 Pet. 3 : 15, "Our beloved brother Paul, *according to the wisdom given unto him*, wrote—" And the allusion is more direct to the *latter* passage than to the former ; for Paul, in Eph. 3 : 4, uses the word *σύνεσις*, but in 2 Pet., and in Polycarp it is *σοφία*.

Let us call Polycarp to the stand once more. (V.) "The young men should be blameless in all things ; above all, taking care of their chastity, and leading themselves as with a bridle from all evil. *For it is good to be driven away from the lusts that are in the world ; because* every lust wars against the spirit."

Polycarp once, when citing from the Gospels, says :—(II.) "Remembering what the Lord said, teaching, Judge not, that ye be not judged," etc. And since he was writing to the Philippians, it was perfectly natural to speak expressly of Paul's Epistle to them, as he does. But although, in Polycarp's very brief letter, he often cites from 1 Pet., yet he never mentions him by name. A specimen of his mode of citing from this apostle is given above. It is there introduced by *ὥστε*, or "because." (He, however, quotes from 1 Pet. without any formula of citation whatever, as in I., II.)

The reference to 1 Pet. 2 : 11, all will readily admit. But is there not, in the clause italicised, an allusion to 2 Pet. 1 : 4 ? "*Having fled from the corruption in the world in lust.*" (Gr.)

The expressions, indeed, are not exactly the same, but the thought is. Polycarp is enforcing the exhortation to chastity, and there is nothing improbable in considering him to allude to 2 Pet. 1 : 4. He introduces his reference to that clause, the sense of which he gives, by "for," or γὰρ. Thus also in chapter VII: "*For* whoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is an antichrist." (1 Jno. 4 : 3.) In 2 Pet. 1 : 4, the reference, in the last clause, is to bodily purity likewise; comp. 2 Pet. 2 : 18, 19, 20. Besides, Polycarp's expressions should be particularly noticed: τὸ ἀναζόπτεσθαι (=to be beaten or forced back, *to be driven away*), ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, (=from the lusts that are in the world.) Now, to be driven away from these lusts, and to flee from them, or to drive oneself away from them, are not very different; one writer uses the active voice, and the other the passive or middle; the verb used is, indeed, different, but the sense is substantially the same. We think, therefore, that Polycarp's allusion to 2 Pet. 1 : 4, is highly probable.

"Whoever," writes Polycarp, (§ VIII.), "perverts (μεθοδεύῃ) the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, he is the first born of Satan." By "oracles of the Lord," the New Testament is meant. For it is agreeable to his manner to call our Saviour "the Lord," and "our Lord;" as in I., II., IV., V. And in § XII., we have these words: "I trust that ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, . . . as in them it is said, 'Be ye angry and sin not;' and, 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.'" These prohibitions are found together only in Eph. 4 : 26. (Compare the first quotation, above given.) And any one who examines carefully the epistle of Polycarp will be astonished at the number of allusions and citations contained in it, taken from various books of the New Testament; and will thereby discover clear evidence of the very early collection of the books of the New Testament, as Scriptural and canonical.

BARNABAS, HERMAS, AND IGNATIUS.

The other so-called Apostolic Fathers, viz. : Barnabas, Hermas, and Ignatius, we pass by, because no allusions to, or citations from 2 Pet. are found in them that are decisive. The epistle of Barnabas was, no doubt, written in the second century, by some believer in Christ so named; but certainly not by Barnabas, the companion and co-worker with Paul. It is, in our judgment, but a flimsy composition, unhappily distinguished by trifling allegorical interpretations. "The Shepherd" of Hermas is a sort of pious fiction, or religious novel, of the same age; from the nature of his work, it was not easy for him to employ direct citation. This work is inferior even to that of the so-called Barnabas; and whether we look at it from a literary, moral, or theological point of view, we hesitate even to consider it milk fit for babes, (as some in the time of Eusebius seem to have done,*) but rather as a goblet, in which there are a few drops of milk, diluted with much water—and sometimes with something worse. With respect to the so-called epistles of Ignatius, it would not be honest to quote anything from them, either from the shorter recension in Greek, or from Cureton's edition; and that because the labors of Pearson, Cureton, and other learned men, have not demonstrated the genuineness of either edition. A thick cloud still hangs over their authenticity, which we hope, however, will before long be dispelled.

It should excite no surprise that there are no more allusions to 2 Pet. in the Apostolic Fathers; for their writings which remain are few in number, small in size, and practical in their aim; their design being, not to give catalogues of the Scriptures of the New Testament, but to incite to love and holy living.

We proceed now to the Apologetic Fathers of this century, or

* E. H. III. 3.

the apologists, who defended Christianity against the assaults of its enemies, whether Jews or Heathen.

JUSTIN MARTYR, ABOUT A. D. 140.

The quotations which follow are taken from his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, (Ed. Robert Stephens, Paris, 1551, pp. 88 and 89.)

2 *Pet.* 3: 8-10. "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord delays not, and *the day of the Lord* shall come," etc.

Justin: "We also understand the saying that the Lord's day is as a thousand years, leads to this." Now, for what purpose does Justin cite this saying? To prove what he conceives to be the true doctrine of the millennium, as stated in holy Scripture, as will be evident from a part of the foregoing and following context. (The point before us is, not whether Justin's views on this subject are true or false; but whether he cites 2 *Pet.* as Scripture.) "Tell me truly," says Typho, "Do you [Christians] confess that this place, this same Jerusalem, is to be rebuilt, and that your people are to be gathered together, and be joyful with the Christ, together with the patriarchs and prophets, and with those of our race, and the proselytes, before ye expect your Christ to come?" To which Justin replies: "I am not such a wretch as to say one thing and mean another. Accordingly, I confessed to thee formerly that I, for my part, truly think so, and many others; as you [Jews] also well know that *this* shall come to pass. But, again, I signified to thee that many of those who are Christians of the pure and godly opinion do not acknowledge *this*.* For I showed thee that some, indeed, are called

* Some think the true reading is: "Christians *not* of the pure and godly opinion." We follow the text of Stephens, as it concerns not the present argument.

Christians, but are atheists and ungodly heretics, since they teach things in all respects blasphemous, atheistical, and unintelligible. But I, and whoever are, in all respects, orthodox Christians, know that there is to be both a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years' (residence) in Jerusalem, built, and adorned, and enlarged; as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others confess: for thus Isaiah spoke concerning *this millennium*.* The passage here cited by Justin is Isa. 65: 17-25, on which he makes a few remarks, and then adds the words above translated: *συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημέσον, ὅτι ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τοῦτο συνάγει, i. e.*, "We also understand the saying that the Lord's day is as a thousand years," conducts to this: *i. e.* We also understand this scriptural expression* as designed, with other passages, to prove this millennium.

That this is Justin's meaning, is clear from what immediately follows: "And a man from among us, named John, one of the apostles of the Christ, in *the Revelation* made to him, prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that shall be the general, and, to speak briefly, the eternal resurrection and judgment of all together; which our Lord also said." Justin then cites Luke 20: 35, 36.

It has often been said that Justin simply refers to Ps. 90: 4. That passage of the Psalmist, probably, was in Justin's memory, when he wrote the citation first given. But to say that he designed especially to allude to it, cannot be demonstrated. For, although the thought is the same, the expressions, in the Psalm are very different. "For a thousand years in thine eyes are *as yesterday when it is passed*, and as a watch in the night;" *i. e.*, "A thousand years are in thine eyes what yesterday, or a night watch, is, in ours." (Hengstenberg in loc.) Jus-

* That Justin uses *τὸ εἰρημέσον* (= *what is said*, or *the saying*.) with reference to what is written in Scripture, or to denote a Scriptural expression, is unquestionable; for after citing Isa. 65: 17-25, he adds: "*This saying*," (the same Greek phrase,) "then, he uttered in these words." *Paul*, also, does the same. Rom. 4: 18.

tin's quotation, then, is decidedly more conformable to the words in this second epistle. Both Justin and the writer of 2 Pet. refer to Isa. 65 : 17-25. (2 Pet. 3 : 13.) But, if it be not certain that Justin designed to refer to Ps. 90 : 4, then he must allude to 2 Pet. 3 : 8-10. For he cites this saying as, in his judgment, contributing to prove the millennium spoken of by Isaiah and other prophets, by the apostle John in the Revelation, and by Christ in the gospel of Luke. It is clear, then, that Justin cites this saying as of equal authority with other inspired writings, and hence as scriptural ; and that he takes it from the second epistle of Peter. And the testimony of this learned and inquisitive man is of great value. The same words have also been quoted by *Irenæus*, and *Clement of Alexandria*. (See Hug's Introd. N. T., by Fosdick, § 179.)

(*Semisch's "Justin Martyr,"* translated by J. E. Ryland, is an interesting and useful work, and an excellent introduction to the study of this Apologist.)

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH.

He wrote "Three books to Autolyceus," about A. D. 180. This work is designed for heathen, and refutes the calumnies as to the doctrine and life of Christians, then imputed to them by the gentiles. In a work of this sort many quotations from the New Testament are not to be expected. Yet he has cited, as Holy Scripture, Matt., Jno., Rom., 1 Tim., and Tit. For instance, the gospel of John is thus cited : "The Holy Scriptures teach us, and all the spirit-moved, among whom John says : 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,' showing, that at the first, God was alone, and in him the Word. Then he says : 'And the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made.'"

There is, also, in this author, undoubted allusions to other books of the New Testament ; and whether, in the following para-

graphs, he alludes to 2 Pet., is the question now to be examined. "Men of God and *spirit-moved by the Holy Ghost*, and hence prophets, inspired and *made wise by God himself*; they were God-taught, *holy* and righteous. Wherefore they obtained the honor to become the organs of God. (This passage is cited most fully by Lardner; also by Hug and Davidson.) *Πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου*, says Theophilus, and in 2 Pet. 1: 21, we have *ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*. And Theophilus, in another place, says, that "the commands of the prophets and writers of the gospel are throughout concordant, because all *the spirit-moved spake by the spirit of God*."*

These passages of Theophilus allude to and paraphrase 2 Pet. 1: 20, 21, and 3: 15. Both writers speak of the men of God or prophets, and as *holy* or consecrated; both say that such men were *moved*† (borne along, or powerfully excited) by the Holy Ghost. Both, also, speak of inspiration under the notion of *wisdom divinely given to men*. Such allusions cannot be accidental; they are designed.

Again: "God's arrangement, then, is this, viz., "His *word, shining as a lamp in a confined room*, has enlightened men everywhere;" (strictly, "has enlightened the earth under heaven;" comp. Col. 1: 23.)—*ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκημένῳ—* (Lib. II.)

2 Pet. 1: 19. "The prophetic *word*, to which ye do well taking heed, *as to a lamp shining in a dismal place*:—*ὡς λύχνος φαίνοντι ἐν ἀρχηρῷ τόπῳ—*.

Neither Theophilus nor the writer of 2 Pet., compares God's word to a lamp, simply, as Davidson assumes; nor is the simile used in reference to a traveler out of doors at night, as in Ps.

* Cited by *Godfrey Less* in his excellent work on "The Authenticity of the New Testament," translated by R. Kingdon.

† See Acts 2: 2, and 27: 15, 17, in the original. This verb, applied to the action of the Spirit on the minds of the prophets is, in the New Testament, found only in 2 Pet.

119: 105; but *Theophilus* employs it with respect to a lamp shining *in a house, or room, or prison*; most likely, the latter, as the same noun is used, Acts 12: 7. (Comp. Luke 11: 33.) Now, *Theophilus*' "confined room," or "secured house," and Peter's "dismal place," (dungeon, or prison) are not very different in expression, while the thought is identical. Such a pointed and peculiar allusion, such a modified quotation, or paraphrase, indicates quite clearly that this second epistle was known and esteemed as a part of Scripture, in this age, at the metropolis of Syria, by this eminent servant of Christ. And we have no reason to suppose that the church at Antioch, over which he presided, was of another opinion.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, ABOUT A. D. 194.

This author's principal extant works are "The *Pædagogus*," and the "*Stromata*." But there is a lost work of his called "*Hypotyposes*," ("Institutions," Outlines, or Sketches,) often mentioned by Eusebius. In his remaining works, 2 Pet. is not expressly mentioned. But the point now before us is, whether Clement was ignorant of this epistle.

Eusebius says: "In his *Institutions*, to speak briefly, Clement gives short explications* of all the canonical Scriptures, *not omitting the controverted*: I mean *the epistle of Jude*, AND THE REST OF THE CATHOLIC (or, general) EPISTLES. Also the epistle of Barnabas, and the book called the Revelation of Peter. *The epistle to the Hebrews*, he says, *was written by Paul*, in the Hebrew tongue; but that Luke carefully translated it, and published it among the Greeks," etc. (E. II. VI. 14.)

Again: (E. II. VI. 13,) "In the *Stromata*, he makes use of testimonies from *the Controverted Scriptures*; also from that book

* Or, "abridged accounts:" ἐπιτετραμμένα διηγήσεις.

called the Wisdom of Solomon, and that of Jesus the Son of Sirach ; also *the epistle to the Hebrews*, that of Barnabas, and Clement, [of Rome,] *and the epistle of Jude*." From the fact that Clement of Alexandria, quoted, or made use of testimonies from ecclesiastical authors, (or even from apocryphal works,) it does not follow that he considered them all equally authoritative. Hodge, in his commentaries, not only makes use of testimonies from the sacred writers, but also from German and American theologians ; yet he does not thereby put them all together in the same category.

Photinus of Constantinople, who lived in the ninth century, and was a learned divine, seems to have had Clement's Institutions in his possession. His testimony is as follows: (Cod. CIX., cited by Lardner, Vol. II., p. 235,) "The Institutions of Clement contain discourses on some passages of the Old and New Testaments, which he also explains and interprets in a brief and summary manner." Again: "The whole scope of his Institutions seems to be an interpretation of Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms, Paul's epistles, *and the Catholic epistles*, and Ecclesiastics."

It seems to us, too evident to be denied, that Clement of Alexandria was acquainted with all the Catholic epistles ; for how could he write brief notes on them, or give abridged narrations of them, if wholly ignorant of them ?* He must, therefore, have known this second epistle. But what authority he gave to it, is somewhat uncertain, for no decision can be had, except by inference.†

Davidson cites a passage from *Hippolytus*, which he considers as an expansion of 2 Pet. 1 : 21. (Vol. III., p. 410.)

* Lardner's chapter on Clement, and Davidson's chapter on the authenticity of 2 Pet., should be consulted and compared on this subject. We pass by Casiodorius, as his testimony is confused.

† Since Clement received the epistle of Jude as inspired, it seems natural to infer that he would so account 2 Pet.

ORIGEN, ABOUT A. D. 230.

36 Eusebius (VI. 25) quotes from Origen thus: "But Peter . . . has left one epistle universally received. *Grant also the second, for on this there is some doubt.*"* Origen, in this context, speaks of the gospel of John, the *Revelation*, and his first epistle, as universally received; admitted by all preceding ancients as works of that apostle; but *all* do not testify to the genuineness of 2 and 3 John, though many do. And of 1 Pet., all, he confesses, received it as genuine; of 2 Pet., he says, its genuineness was doubted of in his day; but that he himself is disposed to receive it as the work of the apostle.

We cite these words of Origen to show that this second epistle was well known in his time; that it had come down from earlier times, and that it was then, as now, ascribed to the apostle Peter, and to no one else; and, moreover, that this critic of the ancient church, did not see any good reason to reject it as a spurious writing; but, on the contrary, was ready and willing to receive it as Peter's. "Let the second, also, be received as Peter's: what is there in the epistle to lead any to reject it? Still it is, with some, a disputed question." This we suppose to be the pith and point of Origen's words above cited, and it is probable that he received it as authentic. It is no valid objection to this, to say that 2 Pet. is not quoted in his extant Greek works, since we have not *all* his writings; and *here* we have his testimony concerning it, from one who was a warm admirer of Origen. His deposition here given is certainly in its favor; for he mentions the doubts of others, not his own. Besides, he nowhere rejects it as spurious.

* The original of the last clause is, *αμφιβαλλετα: γαρ*, = "for it is doubted of," i. e., by others.

FIRMILIAN OF CÆSAREA, IN CAPPADOCIA, ABOUT A. D. 265.

Since Firmilian lived in one of the five provinces of Asia Minor, he must have been well able to trace the testimony of writers and churches there as to Peter's epistle, or epistles, up to the age of the apostles. In his letter to Cyprian of Carthage, the only portion of his writings remaining, is the following passage : "And, moreover, abusing the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as if they had taught this doctrine; *they who in their epistles have cursed heretics, and admonished us to avoid them.*" Adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint; qui in epistolis suis hæreticos execrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt. Here we have an accurate description of one great design of Peter's second epistle, *which Firmilian recognizes as genuine*; for he declares that *Peter*, as well as Paul, has cursed heretics, and admonished us to avoid them. But Peter has not told us the doom of false teachers in his first epistle, but only in the second, 2 Pet. 2: 1-17. He also expressly states that his design is to put us on our guard against them, 2 Pet. 3: 17. It is also very probable that the churches in Cappadocia, and other provinces in Asia Minor, agreed with Firmilian in this matter.

Lardner wishes that we had Firmilian's letter in the original Greek; but we have no reason to be suspicious of the translation we have of it in Latin, as he himself and other learned men admit. Neither does it follow from the fact that Cyprian does not quote 2 Pet. in his works, that Firmilian did not receive it. His testimony above given, shows that he did, and, as Peter's. And Firmilian, living in Cappadocia, had better opportunities of inquiring into, and judging of its author, than Cyprian of Carthage.

2. ¹ **METHODIUS OF OLYMPUS IN LYCIA, ABOUT A. D. 290.**

According to Jerome, Methodius was "first bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and afterwards, of Tyre." (De vir. ill. 83.) Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, mentions him as "bishop of the city called Olympus in Lycia." (VI. 13.) Lardner thinks that his removal to Tyre is not very probable, since such removals or translations of bishops were not then common. Be this as it may, we have two witnesses to the fact that he lived for a while in one of the provinces of Asia Minor.

This author's canon of the New Testament, probably, was the same as that of the Protestant churches now; for he expressly recognizes, as authentic, the four Gospels and the Acts, the epistles of Paul, and that *to the Hebrews* as this apostle's, and *the Revelation* as the work of the apostle John. He calls Christ "the chief shepherd," 1 Pet. 5: 4, and he seems also to allude to the second epistle.

"For the whole world, . . . *deluged with fire, shall be burned for its purification and renewal*.* *πρὸς κάθαρσιν καὶ ἀνακαινισμόν.* And again: "Wherefore it is necessary that both earth and heaven exist again after the conflagration of all things, and the fervent heat:" (*τὸν βρασμόν.*) (Cited by Davidson, III., p. 414.)

Here is no direct quotation, but an unquestionable allusion to 2 Pet. 3: 6, 7, 10, 13. The expression, "*deluged with water*," (*ὑδατι κατακλυσθεῖς*) in 2 Pet. 3: 6, seems to have suggested the phrase which Methodius employs, viz., "*deluged with fire*," *κατακλυζόμενος πυρί.* And when he says that the burning is intended to end in the *purification and renovation* of our world, there is an allusion to 2 Pet. 3: 13, which is peculiarly striking.

* Apud Epiphan. Hæres, LXIV. 31.

Lactantius seems to allude to 2 Pet. 1 : 14, and 2 Tim. 4 : 6, in a passage cited by Lardner, (Vol. III., p. 541.)

Eusebius of Cæsarea seems not to have been satisfied that this second epistle was written by Peter. He does not, however, definitively class it among the number of books decidedly spurious and apocryphal. For he says: (H. E. III., 3,) “As to that work, however, which is ascribed to him, called ‘The Acts,’ and ‘the Gospel according to Peter,’ and that called ‘The Preaching and the Revelations of Peter,’ *we know nothing of their being handed down as genuine*, since neither among the ancient, nor the church writers of our own day, has there been one that has appealed to testimony taken from them.” So sharp and pointed is the distinction made by this witness, between works falsely ascribed to Peter and this second epistle.

The inquiry now naturally arises, Why was he inclined to reject the epistle as Petrine and canonical? Probably from preconceived opinions, or doctrinal prejudice. He was an ardent admirer and zealous defender of Origen. And if Eusebius embraced the opinion of Origen in respect of the ultimate restoration or salvation of all men, he would find a very different doctrine taught in this second epistle.

ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, A. D. 326.

This champion of orthodoxy, with critical and logical acumen far superior to that of Eusebius, has quoted, as apostolical writings, the epistle of James, the first and second epistles of Peter, the first and second epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation. (Lardner, IV., p. 157.)

“*Peter said, ‘that ye might become partakers of a divine nature ;’*” as it is in 2 Pet. 1 : 4. (Orat. I., contra Arian.)

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, A. D. 348.

In his "Catechetical Discourses" he mentions the *seven* Catholic epistles of James and Peter, John and Jude, as properly belonging to the books of the New Testament. (Lardner, IV., p. 173.) He must, therefore, have received this second epistle as an authentic work of Peter.

JEROME, A. D. 392.

This learned man and celebrated commentator, in his letter to Paulinus, speaks of the Catholic epistles thus: "The Apostles James, Peter, John, Jude, have written seven epistles—of few words, but full of sense."

Further citations are superfluous, since all admit that the Catholic epistles were received as genuine by Christians in this century. Even *Ephrem, the Syrian*, in his Greek works, quotes largely from this second epistle, as the Apostle Peter's; representing, no doubt, the views of his brethren. In this age, the canon of the New Testament, embraced by the church, Greek and Latin, was the same as ours.

LOST WRITINGS.

Here let us pause, for a moment, to *regret the loss of many ancient Christian writings of the three first centuries*. In the *first century*, for example, the work of *Papias*, of Hierapolis in Asia Minor, called, "An Explication of the words of the Lord." Eusebius has told us that Papias was a man of feeble intellect. But, for all that, he may have been upright, and competent enough to state plain facts; and his testimonies to the Gospels, as cited by Eusebius, are valuable. If his work, above named, were extant, we could exercise our own judgment as to the char-

acter of his mind, and the nature of his writings. As it is, we must suspend our judgment herein; for Eusebius evidently speaks of him in a pet, and with some prejudice. (H. E. III. 39.)

In the *second century*, we must lament the loss of writings composed by *Dionysius of Corinth*; and particularly that epistle in which "he defended the rule of truth," or canon of our faith, against Marcion's heresy. The Catholic epistles, it is very probable, were mentioned in that treatise, as well as the Pauline. *Tatian's* work on the four Gospels, also, is lost. (Dia Tassarōn.) So is the ecclesiastical history of *Hegeſippus*; a few fragments excepted, which are preserved by Eusebius. *Melito* of Sardis, in Asia Minor, wrote many books, which shared the same fate, viz.: "Of the Prophets," "Of the Church," "On the Lord's day," "Of the obedience of faith," "On the Revelation of John," etc. The work of *Miltiades* against the Montanists is lost, and his writings against the Jews and Gentiles. Also, the treatise which *Theophilus of Antioch* wrote against Hermogenes; only his three books to Autolyceus, before cited, remain. The brief notes, or commentaries, of *Clement of Alexandria*, (called "Hypotyposes," or Institutions,) on various portions of the Old and New Testaments, and particularly on the *Pauline* and CATHOLIC EPISTLES, are lost; which cannot be too deeply regretted. In the *third century*, we have some of Origen's works, only in Latin translations, the author of which has confessed that he made alterations in them, in order to make them conform to the translator's views of orthodoxy. *These works of Origen are worse than lost*—mutilated and falsified. The treatise of *Hippolytus* "Against all heresies," *lately discovered*, is not yet in our possession.

The reader can see, from this brief statement, how very likely it is that much of the evidence for the genuineness of this epistle, and the others doubted of by a few, has been destroyed by the tooth of time.

It should not be forgotten, that *all* the books called contro-

verted by Eusebius, are found in all the ancient manuscripts and versions of the New Testament that are extant, in a complete state; the old Syriac version excepted. Modern critics who doubt of the authenticity of 2d Pet., lay great stress on the fact, that this epistle is not contained in the old Syriac version. This version, if not made towards the end of the first century, was certainly made early in the second. It is very likely, then, that the author of this translation had no knowledge of this epistle at the time when he wrote. He, of course, could not translate a book altogether unknown to him; and this is confirmed from the fact that Ephrem, the Syrian, freely quotes it as Peter's; expressing, no doubt, the sentiment of the Syrian churches of the fourth century. Theophilus of Antioch, in Syria, in the *second century*, also alludes to this epistle, as before shown.

The same critics also attach considerable importance to the fact, that this epistle is not quoted by Tertullian, Cyprian, and others. But the mere fact that this epistle is not cited by these writers, is no certain proof that they rejected it. *What canon of criticism* have we—what rule suggested by good sense, *which makes it binding on any Christian writer, ancient or modern, to cite all the books of the New Testament in his writings; even in those, the aim of which is not to give catalogues of these sacred books?* Surely, *this is an unreasonable demand.* To describe it briefly, it is the essence of nonsense, bottled and labelled.

We have, then, all the evidence from ancient authors of the first three centuries, that could be reasonably expected in the circumstances of the case. The writers who immediately succeeded the apostles, are very few; the Apologists, or defenders of Christianity, did not consider it their business to give catalogues of the New Testament, but to prove to enemies the excellency and truth of the faith delivered to the saints; and they who will review the testimony, as before given, may judge for themselves of its pertinency and validity. Some, perhaps, may be disposed to object

to the fact that we have attached importance to *allusions* to this second epistle, but the objection would be unjust; for when I write here, "Faith in the blood of Christ," I at once show that I am acquainted with one of Paul's epistles. (Rome 3 : 25.)

§ 3. *An examination of the hypothesis that the epistle is a forged composition.*

"This epistle," says Neander, "was probably forged by those who wished to combat the Gnostic errors, and the opinion broached by the Gnostics of a contrariety between the apostles, Peter and Paul, by the borrowed authority of the former."*

It is exceedingly rash, to say the least, to resort to such a hypothesis, in reference to this epistle; besides, it is altogether untenable. To make assertions of this sort, is easy; to demonstrate their truth, is another matter. When a learned man positively declares that this second epistle, always ascribed to Peter, and to none else, is a forgery, he should be clad with impenetrable armor; his arguments should be powerful and irrefutable; which Neander's are not, as we have shown below, in the refutation of the objections drawn from internal evidence. Olshausen† and Davidson‡ have shown more critical sagacity in this particular, and a more unbiassed judgment; the former of whom is satisfied in his own mind that the epistle is Peter's, but thinks that it is difficult to prove it; with whom Davidson seems to concur.

The hypothesis of Neander is untenable, (1,) because it is directly contrary to the testimony of the ancients with respect to the epistle. The question to be settled is, whether Peter wrote it, or some person or persons forged it in his name, and

* "Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles," translated by Ryland. (Book IV., Chap. II.)

† "Proof of the Genuineness of the Writings of the New Testament," translated by Fosdick, and prefixed to Olshausen's Commentary on the Gospels, Vol. I.

‡ "Introduction to the New Testament," Vol. III., Bagster's edition.

the proper way of settling it is by historical evidence. Now, not so much as one ecclesiastical writer, in the first three centuries, has testified to its spurious or apocryphal character; no, not one. Eusebius testifies that the work called, "The Gospel according to Peter," and other works of the same sort, were not at all acknowledged by the ancients as genuine. (II. E. III., 3.) And of these works falsely ascribed to Peter, Jerome likewise says, that the theologians and critics of his day concurred in rejecting them as apocryphal. But *this* is *never* said by *any* of the ancient writers of the Ante-Nicene church, whose works are extant, of the second epistle of Peter.

(2.) The difficulties that seemed to Neander sufficient to brand this epistle as spurious and apocryphal, are no difficulties at all; and this we say with all the deference that is properly due to his eminent learning and ability. For, on this subject, his theory is laid down as law; his *ipse dixit* as decisive. This will not do. No man—no body of men—can be believed when they say that this epistle is spurious, *unless they prove it*. The onus probandi rests, of right, on them.

Neander assumes that Gnostic errors are combatted in the epistle, and hence it must be a writing not of the first century; not Petrine. Thus,

"He flings at our head conviction in the lump,
And comes to grave conclusions—in a jump."

This is not the first time the old proverb has been verified—"The more haste, the less speed." For who, that knows anything accurately of the Apostolic age, can deny that *the germs of Gnosticism were then sprouting*? The inspired, eagle-eyed Paul detected them. 1 Tim. 6 : 20, 21.* And Peter simply predicts

* Some "minute philosophers" have questioned the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, but their Pauline origin has been indisputably proved by Davidson, Olshausen, Hug, and others.

that these germs would speedily grow up into poisonous plants in the garden of God; as was the case in the second century. It does not follow, therefore, that this epistle is spurious, even if it does describe and attack the Gnostic errors, or others of the same genus. Does not Paul (suggested here as an illustration of the mode in which the apostles describe and attack heresy,) say that “the mystery of iniquity was *already working*” in his day? And yet, in the next breath, he goes on to foretell, and describe, its future manifestation and development; the summit and abolition of which will not be reached until the appearing of our Lord. 2 Thess. 2: 7–12. And pray, why may not Peter paint heretics and heresies in the same way?

But we are told that another end, in forging this epistle, was to reconcile the opposition there was between Peter and Paul, as discovered and declared by the Gnostics; and the anxiety of the writer of this second epistle, to show his unity of faith with Paul, is enough, it seems, to prove the epistle spurious! A wonderful argument, indeed! Now, in the first epistle, whose genuineness is unquestionable, and of which Neander says, that “it bears the impress of the apostolic spirit,” Peter shows his anxiety to confirm, by his testimony, the doctrine taught by Paul, and his assistants. For he declares, that *they preached the gospel to them, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.* 1 Pet. 1: 12. And, to this end, he also sends *Silvanus* (or Silas) to them, as the bearer of the epistle. 1 Pet. 5: 12. Such attempts at reasoning may, therefore, be safely set aside as worthless. It is clear, then, that Neander has failed in assigning the motives or aim of the supposed forger in composing the letter.

(3.) The supposition that this epistle is a forgery, by some unknown writer, at the close of the first, or beginning of the second, century, is not at all credible. Such productions are still extant, and their characteristics well known. “It is not credible,” says Michaelis, “that a religionist, of the first or second century, should have imitated Peter so successfully, as to betray no marks

of a forgery ; for the spurious works of those ages, which were sent into the world under the name of apostles, are, for the most part, very unhappy imitations, and discover very evident marks that they were not written by the persons to whom they are ascribed. Other productions of this kind betray their origin by the poverty of their materials, or by the circumstance, that, instead of containing original thoughts, they are nothing more than a rhapsody of sentiments gathered from various parts of the Bible, and put together without plan or order. This charge cannot be laid to the second epistle of Peter. Lastly, it is very difficult, even for a man of the greatest talents, to forge a writing, without sometimes inserting what the pretended author either would not, or could not, have said ; and, to support the imposture, in so complete a manner as not to militate, in a single instance, either against his character, or against the age in which he lived. Now, in the second epistle of Peter, though it has been a subject of examination full seventeen hundred years, nothing has hitherto been discovered which is unsuitable, either to the apostle, or to the apostolic age. We have no reason, therefore, to believe that the second epistle of Peter is spurious, especially as it is difficult to comprehend what motive could have induced a Christian, whether orthodox or heretic, to attempt the fabrication of such an epistle, and then falsely ascribe it to Peter.”* Neander’s hypothesis, then, when examined from a historical point of view, is found to rest on nothing but rotten timber.

§ 4. *Testimony of Jude to the second epistle of Peter, as a work of one of Christ’s apostles.*

(1.) *Was Jude, strictly speaking, an Apostle of Christ ?* He calls himself, “ A servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.”

* Introduction to the New Testament, translated by Marsh. Vol. 4, chap. 28.

The phrase, "*a servant of Jesus Christ*," is not, of itself, sufficient to show that he considered himself an apostle of Christ, in the strict sense. The corresponding Hebrew phrase is often used, indeed, to denote Jehovah's envoys in the Old Testament Church; as Moses and Joshua. *Paul*, in his epistles, styles himself an apostle of Jesus Christ, often with other adjuncts; a few of his letters excepted. (See the inscriptions in Rom. 1 and 2, Cor., Gal., Eph., Col., 1 and 2 Tim., Tit.) In the epistle to Philemon, he calls himself "*a prisoner of Christ Jesus*;" omitting his official designation, probably, because he asks a personal favor, viz., the kind reception of a fugitive slave by his master. In the epistle to the Philippians, he begins thus: "*Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ*;" perhaps, because he had departed, in this instance, from the ordinary construction of his words, when mentioning an assistant, which is thus: "*Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, and Timothy, our brother*." (Col.) If Paul, in Phil. 1: 1, had said, "*Paul and Timothy, apostles of Jesus Christ*," it would not have been true. Timothy was *an evangelist*, not an Apostle. 2 Tim. 4: 5. He, therefore, said, *Servants of Jesus Christ*. In the epistles to the Thessalonians, thus: "*Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, to the church*," etc. Paul's usage, then, as to the mode of designating the apostolic office, is definite and precise; the exceptions admitting of easy solutions. So is that of Peter. 1 Pet. 1: 1. 2 Pet. 1: 1.

But, on the other hand, the omission of the phrase, "*An apostle of Jesus Christ*" in the inscription of an epistle, is not, of itself, enough to prove that the writer was no apostle; and that, because *John*, in his first epistle, omits his name and official title; though he claims inspiration for himself, in the most decided language. (1 Jno. 4: 6.) In his Gospel, his name, indeed, is not found, although he describes himself as "*that disciple whom Jesus loved*," *i. e.*, one of the twelve, a special friend of Jesus. (Jno. 21: 7.) In the Apocalypse, or Revelation, he denominates himself a *servant of Jesus Christ*. Apostolic usage, then, not being

uniform on this point, the first part of the inscription in Jude's epistle, is of doubtful meaning. It may be meant to describe him as an apostle, and it may not.

The additional phrase, "Brother of James," does not remove the obscurity. There were two apostles named James; one, the son of Zebedee, the other, the son of Alphaeus. One of the brethren of our Lord was also named James. Matt. 13 : 55. Mark 6 : 3.

Two, also, of the apostles were called Judas, or Jude; one with the surname *Iscariot*, (a man of Karioth, Josh. 15 : 25;) the other is described negatively by John as "*not Iscariot*." (Jno. 14 : 22.) This Jude is called by Luke, in his gospel, and in the Acts of the Apostles, "Jude, of James;" some contending that the ellipsis must be thus supplied: 'Jude, (the son) of James;' and others, thus: 'Jude, (the brother) of James.' It is generally supposed that this Jude the apostle, 'not Iscariot,' or 'Jude, of James,' is the same as Lebbeus or Thaddeus. One of the brethren* of our Lord was also named Judas, or Jude. Matt. 13 : 55. Mark 6 : 3.

In the Apostolic Church, there was also a Judas, or Jude, sur-named Barsabas, "a leading man among the brethren," and "*α prophet*," or inspired person; next in rank and authority to an apostle. (1 Cor. 12 : 28. Eph. 4 : 11.) Acts 15 : 22-32.

Now, as to the brethren of the Lord, we agree with those who esteem it probable that neither his brother, called James, nor the one called Jude, were apostles. "For not even did his brethren believe on him." Jno. 7 : 5. "It is only after the ascension of Jesus that they appear among the assembled believers. Acts 1 : 14. It is not likely, therefore, that any one of them should have been among the twelve." (See Olshausen, Com. on the Gos-

*Whether the brethren of Jesus were sons of Joseph and Mary, or sons of Joseph by a former wife, as tradition says; or cousins, called brothers, according to Hebrew usage, or sons of Cleophas and Mary; is a question greatly disputed, and not of easy solution. See Schaff. Hist. Apost. Ch., § 95. Olshausen on the Gospels, § 23. Alexander on Mark, 6 : 3.

pels, § 15. See also, Alexander on Mark 6 : 3, and 3 : 13, who objects to this view.)

If then the epistles of James and Jude were written by *apostles*, James, the son of Alphaeus, must be the author of the one, and Jude, brother of this James, the writer of the other. That the son of Alphaeus was the writer of the former, is maintained by Calvin, Davidson, and others ; *some*, however, contend that James, the Lord's brother, was the author of the former, and Jude, a brother of this James, of the latter. Schott, whom Stuart* is inclined to follow, supposes that Jude, surnamed Barsabas, was the author of the latter epistle.

The question as to the authors of these two epistles, is a tangled knot, hard to untie, and one on which we speak without any dogmatism. But the inspiration and canonical authority of the epistles, are not at all affected thereby, inasmuch, as neither James nor Jude denominate themselves Apostles. Besides, even if written by men not apostles, but by *prophets* or *evangelists*,† their inspired and canonical authority would be indubitable. Thus, the whole church, ancient and modern, has received, as canonical, the four gospels, *two of which* were written by men who were *evangelists*, *i. e.*, inspired missionaries, assistants and deputies of apostles ; viz. : the Gospels according to Mark and Luke. The case is the same with respect to the Acts of the Apostles, composed by Luke.

So far as our present argument is concerned, it is of no importance whether Jude's epistle was written by Jude, the apostle, or by Jude, a brother of the Lord—if they indeed are different persons—or by Jude, surnamed Barsabas. If it be not an Apostolic Epistle, in the strict sense, it is, unquestionably, an epistle written by “a prophet” or “evangelist,” and hence inspired ; and an epistle of the first century.

*Hug's Introd. New Testament, § 181, note 43.

†Schaff's Hist. Apost. Ch., §§ 130, 131.

There is, however, a passage in the epistle itself, which seems to intimate that Jude did not regard himself *as an Apostle*, properly speaking—17, 18 vs. “But, beloved, remember ye the things predicted *by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ*, for *they* said to you : ‘In the last time,’ etc. Here the expressions italicised, appear to convey this thought : ‘I, as a prophet, or evangelist of Christ, bid you remember what the apostles said to you, and particularly Peter, whose words I now remind you of.’ Bengel, however, supposes that, if Jude’s intention had been to distinguish himself from the apostles, he would, in the eighteenth verse, have said : “for they said *to us*,” instead of, “*to you*.” Be this as it may, still Jude, certainly, neither in this passage, nor in any part of his letter, calls himself an Apostle of Jesus Christ ; nor does he say, in the words before us, “Remember the things predicted *by us, the apostles*,” but, “Remember the things predicted *by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ*.” Whether our suggestion is justified by this passage or not, still there does not appear a valid reason why theologians and critics should insist on calling Jude an Apostle of Jesus Christ, when he himself studiously shuns that phrase, as appertaining to his office. The wiser and safer way seems to be, to speak of him as a prophet, or evangelist.

(2.) *Is Jude’s epistle genuine ?* It is ; because, according to the testimony of Eusebius himself, the books styled by him controverted, were received as genuine by most ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries ; the best judges in the matter. Clement, of Alexandria, brings a citation from it with this preface : “*Jude spoke prophetically* in his epistle.” Tertullian speaks of him as “the apostle Jude,” meaning thereby, most likely, apostolical missionary,* or evangelist. Origen, in his Greek commentaries on Matthew, often quotes the epistle of Jude, and also says : “Jude wrote an epistle, of a few lines indeed, but full of power-

*As in Acts 14 : 14. Comp. Acts 13 : 1–4.

ful words of the heavenly grace; who at the beginning says, 'Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.'” Lucifer Calaritanus, (of Cagliari in Sardinia,) has quoted largely from this epistle under the name of Jude, the excellent apostle. But we need mention no more witnesses, since, in Lucifer's time, (the fourth century,) ‘the controverted books’ were generally received by churches and theologians.

The principal objections urged against the genuineness of the epistle, from the time of Origen until now, has been drawn from the alleged fact that Jude quotes from apocryphal authors, ‘the book of Enoch,’ and ‘the Ascension of Moses’—14, 15 vs., and 9 v. But has it been satisfactorily established that he has done so? Are the proofs that these books were extant in the first century, and that Jude cited them, unanswerable? Let us admit all this, however, for the sake of argument, and then what follows? The spuriousness of the Epistle? By no means. Jude was warning the brethren against those who shamefully perverted the gospel; if he, then, laid hold of arms, on which these men relied, what can there be unsuitable in that? If Jude quoted books which these perverters of the gospel considered authoritative, pray, where was the wrong in cutting off the heads of these Philistines with their own swords? Besides, the quotation of a passage of an apocryphal work, by an inspired writer, is not an approval of the whole work, but only of the passage cited: Or it may be no more than a clever argumentum ad hominem, and intended to express neither approval or disapproval of it, on the part of the sacred penman. Neither is there, in the epistle, any thing unworthy of an inspired writer, or repugnant to apostolic doctrine.

(3.) *Jude cites the second epistle of Peter as the work of an apostle of Christ.* To establish this, will be easy, after some stumbling blocks have been taken out of the way. The striking likeness existing between the epistle of Jude, and the second chapter of the second epistle of Peter, has often been noticed,

and is so obvious that it forces itself on the attention, even of a superficial reader. How is this fact to be explained? Not by denying what is unquestionably true, but in "a more excellent way." Some account for it, by saying that Peter made use of Jude's epistle. Thus, Hug and Davidson. Others, by saying that Jude made use of Peter's second epistle. So Œcumenius, Luther, Mill, Storr, Schaff, and Hengstenberg. Olshausen accounted for it, by supposing that Peter and Jude met, and had a conference on the best mode of crushing the heretics. Sherlock supposed that Jude and Peter both made use of a common document, or drew from the same source, in their own way; and this opinion has been favored by Benson, Scott, and Doddridge.

This diversity of explanation shows, either that the subject is difficult, or most of the writers confused. Like the blind man, when just recovering his sight, they see very indistinctly; men walking, look like trees

Olshausen's solution is a figment of his imagination, and pure conjecture, without a shadow of proof. If ancient writers had testified to such a meeting, it might deserve a moment's attention; as the case is, it does not.

Sherlock's explanation is no better, though more ingenious. For he assumes, without proof, that such a writing was extant in the first century, and that both writers copied it, according to their own taste. But it will not do, to bring forward an invention of fancy, to explain a fact like the one under consideration.

Neither has it been proved that Peter made use of Jude's epistle. The arguments which Hug employs in favor of this hypothesis, are not convincing. It does not follow, from the fact that the style of 2 Pet., and especially the second chapter, is adorned with figures, and copiously expressed, that therefore Peter copied Jude, by embellishing his language, and amplifying his expressions; and that because a copious and ornamental style is altogether Petrine. The other argument of Hug is founded on a comparison of 2 Pet. 2: 11, with Jude, 9 v. But it has not been

demonstrated that both writers refer to the same subject. And even if they did, it would not prove that Peter uses the word "dignities" in the sense of angels. The arguments of Davidson, in support of this hypothesis, so far as they differ from those of Hug, are mere gossamer webs, which it is not worth while to touch and break.

The only credible supposition, is, that Jude made use of this second epistle; and the unanswerable argument for it is, that *Jude himself acknowledges as much; for he quotes from this epistle as an apostolic writing.* (Jude, 17, 18 vs.) "But you, beloved, remember the things* predicted by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, for they said to you: 'In the last time there shall be scoffers, walking according to their ungodly lusts.'" Comp. 2 Pet. 3: 3. Now, Peter alone, of all the apostolic writers, has this sentence in his second epistle. And Jude certainly quotes it. He quotes it, too, as said by one of Christ's apostles: "For *they*," (the apostles mentioned just before,) "told you that 'in the last time there shall be scoffers,'" etc. Thus clearly, does Jude give his testimony, as an inspired writer, to the second epistle of Peter, as a genuine apostolic writing. It must, therefore, be indeed Peter's.

We before regretted the loss of many uninspired works of the first three centuries, but we may now rejoice that we have the testimony of an inspired writer of the apostolic age and church, to the authenticity of the second epistle of Peter. Since the testimony of such a writer is infallible, we need not hesitate to conclude, that no book has, or can have, a more unquestionable right to its place in the canon of the New Testament.

*Davidson thinks that τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημέτων, in Jude, implies that the words referred to, were spoken, not written. But ῥῆμα means a thing, as well as a word. And nothing is more common in Scripture, than to refer to a writer as speaking: e. g. "In all *his* epistles, speaking *in* them," etc. 2 Pet. 3: 16. "What *says* the Scripture?" Rom. 1: 3. "Isaiah is very bold, and *says*." Rom. 10: 20.

II.—§ 1. *Internal evidence as to the authenticity of the epistle.*

The writer not only called himself Simon Peter, a servant, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, but he also alludes to facts, which clearly indicate that Peter is meant. Thus, 1: 14, he refers to what Christ had said concerning his death, recorded by John 21: 18. He declares, also, that he was one of the witnesses of our Lord's transfiguration, 1: 16-18. Now Peter, James and John were the only apostles who beheld the transfiguration. And this epistle has never been ascribed by any of the ancients, to James or John, but only to Peter. He calls Paul his beloved brother, and speaks of his epistles as truly inspired writings, 3: 15, 16. In calling Paul his brother, *i. e.*, his brother as an apostle, he seems to allude to Gal. 2: 7-9; where Paul declares that Cephas (or Peter,) James and John gave him the right hand of fellowship. And in calling him his *beloved* brother, there is an allusion to Gal. 2: 11-14, which proves that Peter's love to Paul had not been lessened by the pungent rebuke he received for the temporary wavering into which he *was hurried*, by undue deference to the prejudices of his Jewish brethren. (Compare the verb *συνανήχθη*=hurried away, pressed along, as in a crowd, Gal. 2: 13, with 2 Pet. 3: 17, *συνανήχθη*=hurried away.) Surely these delicate allusions are perfectly natural and artless, accordant with the known facts, and such as no forger would have thought of, "even if Satan himself had been at his elbow."

The same doctrine, likewise, pervades both epistles; so far, at least, as the design of each epistle would lead a candid mind to expect, and enough to prove that Peter is the author of the second epistle, as well as the first. That gospel truth is in order to promote the constantly increasing holiness of believers, is clearly stated and enforced in both epistles. 1 Pet. 1: 13-16. 2 Pet. 1: 5-11. The great motive which Peter employs, in his first epistle, to animate believers, in their duties, sorrows and

trials, is drawn from the reward which they shall obtain at Christ's second coming. 1 Pet. 1 : 7-13 ; 4 : 13 ; 5 : 4. And the the great design of his second epistle is to confirm them in the truths taught in the first, as the true grace, or gospel of God, 1 Pet. 5 : 12, with 2 Pet. 3 : 1 ; and this in opposition to those false teachers and scoffers, who either disbelieved the second coming of Christ altogether, or else denied his coming as Judge and Lord.

If our Saviour is not truly God as well as man, he can not be a competent person to "judge the world in righteousness." Acts 17 : 13. He should be man, to "know what sore temptations mean;" and omniscient as God, otherwise mistakes would be made. How else can he judge rightly of all our thoughts, words and deeds? Accordingly, in both epistles, Peter lets us know that our Lord is Jehovah, 1 Pet. 1 : 11 ; 2 : 3, 4 ; or that Jesus Christ is our God and Saviour, worthy of present and eternal adoration. 2 Pet. 1 : 1 ; 3, 18.

Besides, the most sagacious writers, that oppose the genuineness of the epistle, (either wholly, or in a modified way,) admit that the internal evidence of this sort is decidedly in its favor. "Certainly," says Calvin, "the majesty of Christ's Spirit shows itself in every part of the epistle." (Preface to 2 Pet.) "There is nothing," says Davidson, "in the epistle unworthy of an apostle ; nothing inconsistent with the analogy of faith, or with other parts of the New Testament. On the contrary, it breathes an apostolic spirit." (Int. New Testament, III., p. 443.)

§ 2. *Objections to the genuineness of the epistle, derived from internal evidence, stated, and refuted.*

The following extract, from Jerome, will show what it was that led critics of his day, to doubt whether this epistle was Peter's : "Peter wrote two epistles, called Catholic ; the second of which is denied by most to be his, *because of the difference of style from*

the former: quarum secunda a pleris ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam. “*But other books*,” (*i. e.*, books claiming to be written by him,) “one of which is called his Acts, another his Gospel, a third his Preaching, a fourth his Revelation, a fifth his Judgment, are ranked among apocryphal books, and are rejected as spurious:” inter apocryphas scripturas repudiantur. (De vir. ill.)

The second epistle of Peter, then, was not rejected as a spurious, or forged composition, like the apocryphal books ascribed to him; but critics then said, that its style led them to entertain doubts of its authenticity. Jerome often wrote in hot haste, and allowances, therefore, must be made for his unguarded expressions. He meant to say, that a considerable number of persons, qualified to examine such a question, doubted its genuineness, in his day, and that these doubts were occasioned by the style of the writer, not because of the matter, or contents of the writing.

The doubts of some very eminent modern theologians, have arisen from the same source. Hence, Calvin, in his preface to 2 Pet., says: “Notwithstanding some affinity in style, the differences between it and the former, are such, as to indicate that they had not the same author.” And again: “Since the majesty of the Spirit of Christ certainly shows itself in every part of the letter, I have conscientious scruples about wholly rejecting it; I do not, however, recognize in it Peter’s genuine style,” (or mode of expression.) He supposes, therefore, that it was, probably, written by a *disciple* of Peter, just before his martyrdom, *approved by the apostle, and so published*. But this is pure conjecture, without even a broken reed of historical evidence to lean on, and therefore, worthless.

But let us *weigh* the *principal objections* to the authenticity of this epistle, taken from internal evidence, and not surrender our judgments, hoodwinked, to any great name, either of ancient or modern times. These objections are stated by Neander, in a note to his “History of the Planting and Training of the Chris-

tian Church," by Ryland. (Book 4, Chap. 2.) His arguments are of two classes: first, he gives "the principal marks of the spuriousness of the epistle," and then "the circumstances that excite suspicion."

The principal marks of the spuriousness of the epistle, according to the view of Neander, are the following: (1.) The great difference of character and style, between this epistle and the first. Now, it may be considered presumptuous, by our readers, for us to oppose Neander, Calvin, and others, in this particular; but since the year 1851, when our exposition of the first epistle was published, we have often compared the two epistles in the original, and can not discover such a total disparity, in style, as is asserted. On the contrary, there are unmistakable indications that both epistles are the productions of the same author.

Here we should observe that *the mode* employed by German critics, and their followers, in their attempts to prove, from its style, the spuriousness of this epistle, (and in other similar efforts,) is liable to grave objections. They insist, for example, on the numbers of words found in the first epistle only, and not in the second, nor elsewhere in the New Testament. As if, forsooth, a writer must be confined to a stereotyped set of words and phrases, or his productions be branded as spurious, by these great masters of literary criticism! As if different subjects, or different modes of handling a subject, or feelings excited or composed, made no difference in a writer's expressions! These gentlemen also take out their microscopes, and carefully examine the linkings of a writer's verbal construction; and if, in one epistle they find a somewhat varied mode of arranging words into sentences or propositions, they forthwith denounce the epistle as spurious! Even if a word, or phrase, is too often repeated to suit their highly cultivated taste, they pounce upon "the drawling construction" with the foolish demand, that he, whose words run tolerably smooth in one epistle, should never once stutter in another. They tell us also, that the appellations given to the

Father and to Christ are different, or variously used in the two epistles. For example, "The Lord" is too frequently used in the second epistle in reference to Christ; it ought to have been used, say they, if Peter were its author, in reference to the Father. But in 1 Pet. 1: 3; 2: 3, (compared with 2: 4,) it unquestionably denotes Christ. And since the false teachers denied that their professed Redeemer was their Lord or Sovereign, and infidels scoffed at the very idea of his appearing as Judge, it was perfectly natural, and meet, for the apostle to insist on the fact that he who is Lord and Redeemer, is one and the same, full both of mercy and justice. (2 Pet. 2: 1.)

In the two epistles different expressions are used to denote Christ's second coming: 1 Pet. 1: 7, "the revelation of Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 3: 4-10; 2: 9. "His coming," "the day of the Lord," "the day of Judgment." Now, besides the fact that these varied phrases are precisely suited to the design of the second epistle, it is nonsensical to assume, that one and the same person must always employ the same expressions, when treating of the same thing. And yet, this sophism is built on this assumption! If Hodge, the well known commentator, were to preach at Princeton on one Sabbath, and speak of 'the second appearing of our Lord,' and on another Lord's day, in the city of New York, were to address the audience on 'the coming of Christ to judge mankind,' he would, by this Higher Criticism, be proved thereby, to have lost his personal identity!

Again, the writer of the second epistle does not quote formally from the Old Testament, nor weave its expressions into his letter, as is done in the first epistle. But he unquestionably refers to Isa. 65: 17-25, and Isa. 66: 22-24, for he takes thence the expressions, "the new heavens and the new earth;" nay, he refers to it by an indisputable formula of quotation, "according to his promise." 2 Pet. 3: 13. And how a man, of delicate and discriminating taste, can read the second chapter of this epistle, and especially his graphic descriptions of the heretics, and not dis-

cover one thoroughly imbued with the very soul and spirit of the Old Testament prophets, passes our comprehension. In the case of Noah and the deluge, the destruction of the cities of the Plain with the deliverance of Lot, his allusion likewise to Balaam, and to the Proverbs of Solomon, and all in one short chapter, sufficiently show that the apostle Peter is the writer. The discrepancy asserted exists, not in the epistle, but in the imagination, of the objectors. And if Peter does not, in this epistle, so often convey his thoughts by Old Testament phrases, as he does in the first epistle, what demonstration can that fact be that the epistle is not genuine? Must an apostle not have the liberty, if at any time he prefers it, to express his thoughts in his own language? Besides, his reference to the Old Testament, and particularly to the prophetic portions of it, is of itself sufficient to refute this objection. 2 Pet. 1: 19-21. For he refers to the canon of Scriptural Prophecy, as an indisputable proof of the certainty of Christ's second coming; and that was sufficient for his scope in this epistle. And yet Davidson considers this objection unassailable!

We assure our readers, that the above specimen of objections against this epistle, derived from its style and construction, is no caricature;* nor have we selected the flimsiest arguments. Such a mode of assailing the genuineness of any writer, must be considered wholly unwarrantable; but when it is applied to a sacred writer, it borders on the skeptical and profane.

Neander, however, in the place before referred to, enters into no details whatever, but assumes a total disparity of style in this epistle, when compared with the first; as if it were a matter too manifest to be proved!

There is one characteristic of Peter's style—a leading and striking one—which has been overlooked by grammatical hairsplitters and word-explainers; and this peculiarity appears de-

*See Davidson's Int. New Testament, vol. 3, p. 430, etc.

cidedly in both epistles, showing that both proceeded from the apostle. The rhetorical figures employed by him are, so to speak, chiefly meant *for the eye*: he shows a liking for visual imagery. We begin with specimens from the *first epistle*, with occasional citations, or references, to the second.

He calls the Christians addressed "*Strangers*," (1: 1,) in the world. "*Sojourners and Strangers*," 2: 11. We may follow them with our eye as they walk, faint and wearied through the wilderness.

He declares that God's renewed children have an inheritance, or patrimony, that is "*incorruptible*," incapable of decay; they will never perceive it to be dust and ashes in their hands. It is likewise "*undefiled*;" not a blot or stain of sin will ever be detected on it. And "*it fadeth not away*;" it is an amaranthine patrimony, fresh and fair as a new-blown rose, the fragrance of which will ever be delightful. 1: 4; comp. 5: 4.

To show that the inheritance is secured for such, he says, that it is "*guarded on high*," or kept in the heavens, "for them." And, moreover, that "*they are garrisoned in God's power*," as in an impregnable fortress, by "faith for salvation." 1: 4, 5.

Speaking of the joy of those who believe in, and love Christ, his expressions are: "*Ye leap up*, with joy unspeakable, and glorified." Comp. 4: 13. (Gr.)

"Which things angels desire *to look into*;" *to bend down and get a near look at*, as the original signifies. 1: 12.

"Wherefore, *by girding up the loins* of your mind, *by keeping sober*, hope, to the end, for the Grace *that is to be brought to you*," (presented, put in your hands,) "at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1: 13.

"Wherefore, *laying aside* all malice." 2: 1.

"The *laying aside of my tent*." 2 Pet. 1: 14.

"*Coming to whom, a living stone*, ye, also, as *living stones are built up*, a spiritual house, a consecrated company of priests, *to offer up spiritual sacrifices*." 1 Pet. 2: 4, 5.

"*They strike against the Word.*" 2: 8. "Fleshly lusts, which *war* against the soul." 2: 11.

"*To muzzle* these foolish men's ignorance." 2: 15.

"Not only to the good and gentle, but also to *the crooked*," 2: 18.

"If one *bear up under* griefs." 2: 19.

"*That ye should follow closely his foot prints.*" 2: 21

"*We did not follow cunningly devised fables*;" we did not take them as our guides. 2 Pet. 1: 16; comp. 2 Pet. 2: 2, 15.

"That your prayers *be not hindered*;" *i. e.*, *cut off* and fall like a tree, according to one reading; according to another, that *no trenches be dug* by your own hands to prevent your approach to God. 3: 7.

"*Arm yourselves with the same mind.*" 4: 1. "*Take a low place*, then, *under the mighty hand of God*, that he *may lift you up* in due time." " *Casting off* all your anxiety *on him.*" "*Be sober, keep awake.*" 5: 6-8.

"*Ye shall carry off*" (bear away) "*a crown of glory, that fadeth not away.*" 5: 4; comp. 1: 9. (Gr.) "*Shall carry off* the *pay* (wages) of unrighteousness." 2 Pet. 2: 13.

"This is the true grace of God, in which ye stand." 5: 12. "For if ye have these things, and they abound, they *make you stand* neither idle," etc. 2 Pet. 1: 8. (Gr.)

But the same striking peculiarity of style appears also in *the second epistle*; the same fondness for rhetorical figures derived from the sense of sight. Thus, he describes one destitute of the virtues mentioned, 1: 5, 7, as *short-sighted*, 1: 9. And true Christians, *richly clad with these graces*, as triumphantly *entering into* the everlasting kingdom and Saviour. 1: 11. He compares "the Prophetic Word" to "a lamp shining in a dismal place," to which we must "attend until daylight shall burst through." 1: 19.

He paints the false teachers as those *who shall smuggle into* the church deadly heresies; as bringing down on their own heads, as a crushing stone, swift destruction. 2: 1. As avaricious merchants, making a gainful trade of their disciples, buying and sell-

ing them as a bale of goods. 2 : 3. The doom of such teachers *lingers not* ; their destruction *slumbers not*. And in illustrating the certainty of their punishment, he says : "For if God spared not angels, when they sinned, but *hurling them down to hell*, bound *in chains* of darkness," etc. Here the same Peter appears before us ; the same delight in visual figures is indubitable. And the reason why this peculiarity is more frequently exhibited in the second chapter of the second epistle is, because the apostle's mind is more excited than usual ; being justly indignant when describing the feigned doctrines and shameful behavior of those heretics, whose portraits he has taken with no ordinary pencil. This very objection then, to which such undue importance has been attached, both in ancient and modern times, when carefully examined, is found to be not a principal mark of spuriousness, but a weighty proof of the genuineness of this epistle.

(2.) Having shown the rhetorical analogy existing in the two epistles, and proved that the pretended grammatical disparity dwells nowhere but in the fancy of critics, we proceed to the next principal objection. Neander *takes for granted*, as before, that the author of this second epistle partly imitated and partly copied the epistle of Jude. But is this so evident that we can assent to it without one grain of proof? On the contrary, Jude evidently made use of this second epistle, from the fact, that he cites 2 Pet. 3 : 3, as before shown.

(3) It is supposed that the writer of this epistle speaks of himself as the personal teacher of those addressed, which does not correspond with Peter's relation to the churches, as stated in the first epistle. If this were indeed the fact, it would be a weighty objection. But *where* does the author of this letter declare or imply, that *he* had been *the oral instructor* of the churches in the five provinces? When he says : "*We made known* to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 1 : 16, it necessarily follows that he taught them that truth by his own lips. A truth can be made known by the pen, as well as by the

mouth. The reference is, not to his oral instruction, but to the first epistle. 5: 4; 4: 13; 1: 5~~4~~, 7~~2~~, 13. Paul also uses the verb in the same way, 1 Cor. 12: 3: "Wherefore, *I am making known* to you, that no one speaking by the spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed;" where Paul refers to *what is written* in that verse. Compare 1 Cor. 15: 1, with the third verse, where the expression, "*I am making known* to you the gospel," refers to his written defence of the doctrine of the resurrection which he was then making; and the phrases, "which I preached to you," "for I delivered to you," refer to his former oral teaching. The argument of Neander then, on this topic, "vanishes into thin air."

(4.) "The solicitude with which he endeavors to make himself known as the apostle Peter, betrays an apocryphal writer." A wonderful argument, truly! As if an apostle, warning the churches against false teachers, should not insist on the fact that he was indeed a legate of Christ! Besides, the same way of arguing on which Neander here leans, would sweep away at once both the epistles to the Corinthians, and the epistle to the Galatians; and yet these letters were unquestionably written by Paul, and have been always and universally acknowledged and received as such. What then does such reasoning prove?

(5.) "The allusion to the words of Christ, John 21: 18, is brought forward in an unsuitable manner, 2 Pet. 1: 14." *In what respect* this allusion is *unsuitable*, the objector has not condescended to inform us. The author of this epistle alludes to his swiftly approaching death as a motive, urging him to write this letter, designed to put the churches on their guard against false teachers. Now, where is the consistency of his alluding to his swiftly approaching martyrdom for the truth, while in the very act of writing for the last time in its defence and confirmation?

There are ancient ecclesiastical writers who say, that Peter was crucified not only, but *with his head downward*; and that the apostle himself *desired* to be so crucified!* Such miserable stuff,

* These writers are the celebrated *Origen*, (see Eusebius, E. H., III. 1.) and *Jerome*. (De V. E., cap. I.)

“taken from the dragnet of antiquity,” surely betrays a writer over credulous, embracing a false and morbid humility. But the writer of this epistle shows not the least symptom of such a sickly temper of mind. He simply refers to what the Lord had told him as to the manner of his death, and gives the near approach of that death as a reason why he is so anxious to guard and feed the flock addressed. In this, what is there unsuitable? Nay, is it not in all respects suited to the character of the apostle Peter, who loved both Christ and his people so fervently?

(6.) “In order to distinguish himself as a credible witness of the life of Christ, he appeals to the phenomena at the transfiguration. But it certainly is not natural to suppose that one of the apostles should select and bring forward from the whole life of Christ, of which they had been eye-witnesses, this insulated fact, which was less essentially connected with that which was the central point and object of his appearance; the apostles were rather accustomed to claim credit as witnesses of the suffering and resurrection of Christ.”

Neander in this paragraph, shows that *he has altogether mistaken the design* of the writer of this epistle in his appeal to what took place at the Transfiguration of our Lord; it was *not* to designate himself as a credible witness of Christ’s life and sufferings on earth, during his *first* appearing among men; though he was such a witness. (1 Pet. 5: 1.) *Neither* is this wonderful fact, the transfiguration, an *insulated* one, but *connected most intimately* with Christ’s *second coming* in power and glory, to recompense both the righteous and the wicked, and especially false teachers and scoffers. And the writer of this epistle alludes to it for this end as a sample, or specimen of the manner in which our Lord is to come the second time to our world. (Comp. 1: 16–18, with 1: 5–11, and see 2: 1, 3, 9; 3: 3, 4, 7–13. The reference therefore, when properly understood, is in perfect keeping with the main design of the epistle; and the most plausible argument of the critic is based on “an egregious blunder;”

demonstrating that the chief scope of this epistle, was not discerned by him, at least, in the reference of its writer to the transfiguration.

We are told indeed, that "the apostles were accustomed to claim credit as witnesses of the sufferings and resurrection of Christ." But why, unless to prove by the correspondence of facts in Christ's life with Scriptural Prophecy, that he who had come in the flesh, was in truth the Messiah and the only Saviour? (See Acts 2: 22-36.) But does it follow from this, that an apostle *may not*, and *must not* refer to Christ's transfiguration as a proof, or specimen of his ability to come again as King and Judge, as a picture of the manner of his appearing? Will we believe the apostles only when they are witnesses of Christ's prophetic and priestly office, but disbelieve their testimony in reference to his kingly and judicial office? Why did the apostle of the Gentiles write his epistles to the Thessalonians? Was it that we might sneer at the testimony given in them, of Christ's second coming? Neander's objections then as to this matter, are worthless, being altogether irrelevant.

He also says, that by calling the mountain on which the transfiguration occurred, "the *holy* mount," the hand of a later writer is shown; and the only reason given is that Mount Zion, usually called holy, can not be meant. But who supposes that Zion is intended? Would not this mode of reasoning, (if such it can be called,) prove, that wherever in any part of Scripture Mount Zion is called "holy," a forger had been busy? But the Jews, it may be said, were familiar with such a use of the term, since their law ascribes holiness to certain places, as well as persons. True, but why? Is it not owing to the fact, such persons were especially consecrated to God's service; and that such places were distinguished by extraordinary manifestations, permanent or temporary, of God's presence? And was there not such a manifestation of the divine presence on the mount where Christ was transfigured? Beyond all doubt there was. To deny it, is

to step beyond to the ranks of the skeptical army. Neander might as well consider the book of Exodus a spurious production; for when Jehovah the Son, appeared to Moses, he called the place where he then manifested himself, "holy." (Ex. 3: 5, with John 1: 18.)

The circumstances that excite suspicion concerning the author of this epistle, are in his view, the following:

(1.) He thinks it a suspicious circumstance that "Jude speaks of the false teachers as actually existing, but the writer of this epistle as about to appear." But we have before proved that Jude made use of this epistle, and hence wrote subsequently. Besides, as before shown, the germs of the heresies foreshown in their future development, were already working when this epistle was written.

(2.) "The doubts respecting Christ's second coming, and the disappointment felt, because of its delay," furnish no good grounds to suspect the authenticity of the letter. For the Thessalonians made a mistake as to Christ's coming which Paul corrected. (2 Thess. 2.) Now the evidence for the genuineness of these epistles is overwhelming: they can not be suspected on such a ground as this. Besides, the believers addressed in this letter, "had no such doubts, and felt no such disappointment. The writer refers to unbelievers, who sneered at Christ's coming as a pure dream of superstitious men. 3: 3, 4.

(3.) "What is said of the origin of the world from water, and its destruction by fire, does not correspond to the simplicity and practical spirit of the apostolic doctrine, but rather indicates the spirit of a later age, mingling much that was foreign with the religious interest." But why should any entertain a suspicion of the genuineness of the epistle because of what the writer says, as to the origin of our world? Is it inconsistent with the Mosaic cosmogony? And has a better cosmogony ever been published?

And as to its destruction by fire, the writer of this epistle does

not teach that our world is to be driven back into nothingness, or annihilated; but that it is to undergo a great change by fire, and then, in its renovated state, to become the abode of the righteous. And is the hand of the Almighty too weak to effect this? Is his promise unworthy of credit? Isa. 65: 17; 66: 22.

Neither does the author of this letter speak of this change, as a mere natural philosopher, but with the true practical spirit of an apostle, as is evident from his animated exhortation to holiness, mingled with his description of the awful scene. 3: 11, 12.

What Neander means, by the writer's mingling foreign matters with the religious interest, is not easy to understand. If he refers to the doctrines of the Stoics and others, about the destruction of our world by fire, then he should have demonstrated two things: first, that their doctrine, and that taught in this epistle, is one and the same; and next, that it is a false doctrine; otherwise there is no reason to suspect that Peter is not the author of this letter.

(4.) "The mode of citing the Pauline epistles, confirms also the suspicion against the genuineness of this epistle. A passage from Rom. 2: 4, is cited in 3: 15, as if this epistle were addressed to the same church."

Here, again, the critic takes for granted the very thing he should have proved. The passage from Rom. 2: 4, is as follows: "Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to *repentance*?" Is this text cited in 2 Pet. 3: 15? "And account the long-suffering of our Lord *salvation*." What proof have we of it, except the mere say-so of the objector? What then is the reference? We reply, that 1 Tim. 2: 4, and Eph. 3: 1-7, are alluded to in 3: 15; the destination of both of which epistles, was Ephesus in Asia, the proconsular Asia mentioned, 1 Pet. 1: 1. That the allusions are as stated, will appear from citing the passages. "And account the long-suffering of our Lord *salvation*, even as our beloved brother Paul, also, ac-

according to the wisdom given unto him, wrote unto you." 2 Pet. 3: 15. "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men *to be saved*, and come to the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. 2: 4. The first clause of 2 Pet. 3: 15, is an allusion to this passage of Paul, and both convey in substance the same sentiment. The writer of this epistle declares, that the apparent delay of the great day should be considered by men as furnishing them with opportunities to obtain salvation. And Paul says, that God our Saviour is determined to save men of all classes, whether in private or public life, and hence, gives them opportunities of becoming acquainted with the gospel or the truth, as to the way of salvation.

"For this cause, I Paul, Christ's prisoner, for you Gentiles. Since ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God *which has been given me* for your sakes: that by revelation the mystery has been made known unto me, as I wrote just before briefly, in reference to which matter, ye can, by reading, perceive *my understanding in the mystery of Christ*, which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as now it is revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel; of which [gospel] I became a minister, according to *the gift of God's grace that has been given me*, by the effectual working of his power." Eph. 3: 1-7.

Here are clear and abundant expressions, corresponding to the *latter clause* of 2 Pet. 3: 15, written too in the first instance, to Christians dwelling in the capital city of the Roman province, Asia. This objection of Neander then, when sifted, is found to be no better than chaff; and when the real allusions of the writer of this epistle are discovered, they furnish, as we have seen, a pointed and convincing proof of the genuineness of his letter.

(5.) "A collection of all the Pauline epistles is referred to, and

it is assumed, that Paul, in all of them, referred to one subject, which yet by no means, appears in all."

Neander seems to suppose that a collection of Paul's epistles could not have been made until the second century, and hence he is led to suspect the authenticity of this epistle. "But," replies Olshausen,* "this assumption that the collection of the Pauline epistles was first made at so late a period, is by no means susceptible of proof. Indeed, in the fourth chapter, we attempted to prove it not improbable that even Paul himself made a collection of his epistles. At all events, no historical fact can be adduced against this hypothesis, and we must, therefore, consider this much as certain, that the mention of a collection of Paul's epistles ought not to induce us to conclude against the apostolic origin of this epistle."

Paul's epistles were very highly esteemed by the primitive Christians, and Paul himself earnestly urged them to read and circulate his letters. 1 Thess. 5: 27; Col. 4: 16. And when a church, or society of believers, received a letter from the great apostle, what more natural than to suppose that they would send, as soon as possible, an accurate copy of it to one or more of the nearest churches, and they again to others? And since Paul's epistles were written *before* Peter sent forth his, what absurdity is there in supposing the Christians of Asia Minor to be acquainted with them? The bearers of the Pauline epistles had abundant opportunities before A. D. 64, or A. D. 68, (the date of his martyrdom assigned by chronologists,) to go from *Rome* to *Philippi* and *Thessalonica*; from thence to *Corinth*; from Corinth, across the Ægean sea, to *Ephesus*, and so to *Galatia* and *Colosse*; and yet, forsooth, in Asia Minor, the great field of Paul's labors, Christians must be supposed to have a collection of his epistles, only after A. D. 100! Accordingly, Lardner, no

* "Proof of the Genuineness of the Writings of the New Testament," translated by Fosdick. (Vol. I., Com'y on the Gospels.)

common judge on a topic like this, says: "*Before the end of the first century, yea, not very long after the middle of it, it is likely there were collections made of the four gospels, and most of the other books of the New Testament, which were in the hands of a good number of churches and persons.*" (History of the Apostles and Evangelists, Chap. III.)

But it is not necessary to suppose that the writer of this epistle refers to a complete collection of the Pauline letters in the strictest sense; for when he employs the clause, "As also in all his epistles," it seems to be used in manifest contrast to 3:15, "Even as Paul wrote *to you*." (1 Tim., Eph.) So that the sense seems to be this: "Our beloved brother Paul wrote, by divine inspiration, especially to you living in Ephesus in Asia, or to you Christians in Asia Minor; also, in most of his letters, not written directly to you, he speaks of these matters." According to this view, "all" signifies 'all that are now known to you,' or most; and this interpretation is not forced, or far-fetched, but natural and obvious.

Nor is it self-evident that the author of this letter takes it for granted that Paul, in his epistles, "refers only to *one subject*." "Speaking in them of *these things*," 2 Pet. 3:16. Now, since 2 Pet. 3:14-18, contains the conclusion of the epistle, why may we not suppose that the writer refers to all the leading topics set forth in the whole letter? In the first chapter, the necessity of growth in holiness is maintained as a proof, or evidence of sincere acknowledgment of Christ, 1:5-9; and as that without which none shall enter into his future everlasting kingdom, 10, 11 vs. Then, the certainty of his coming to reward the holy in it, is proved from the transfiguration of our Lord, and from the Prophetic Word. In the second chapter, the characteristics and doom of False Teachers, at the day of judgment, are chiefly set forth; though the deliverance of the righteous from a state of trial is also declared. In the third chapter is foretold the rise of scoffers, who ridicule the second coming of our Lord as "a cun-

ningly devised fable." After a brief refutation of them, he directs his discourse to the pious, and foretells the conflagration, and then the renovation of our world, at Christ's coming, as the dwelling place of the righteous. "These things" are the chief topics of this second epistle.

Now the author of this epistle says, that Paul, in all of his epistles known to them, but not directly addressed to them, speaks of these topics. Any one can see for himself, that this is true, by studying the epistles to the Thessalonians as to the coming of our Lord to reward the pious and punish the wicked; and the epistle to the Romans, with respect to the renovation of the world at the same epoch. 8: 18-23. With respect to the progress in holiness, as proof of a sincere profession, and as necessary for admission into Christ's kingdom, see Phil. 1: 27; 3: 12-15; 1 Thess. 3: 6-8; 12, 13; 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10. As to false teachers and their doom, see 2 Cor. 2: 17; 11: 13-15; Phil. 3: 2; 18, 19. The writer of this epistle *does not say* that Paul treats *only* of these things in the epistles referred to, but that Paul agrees with him as to the certainty of Christ's coming, the place, and subjects of his kingdom; and the excision of all the unholy, and especially of false teachers and scoffers, with their disciples and imitators; all which is true. This objection, therefore, must be considered as harmless as an exploded bomb.

(6.) The last objection is,^a that in 2 Pet. 3: 16, the writer speaks of Paul's epistles as having the same authority with the writings of the Old Testament. That he does so, is too evident to be denied, although some have *forced* another meaning out of his words. The term "Scripture," (and also in the plural, "Scriptures,") certainly means, in the writings of the other apostles, the books of the Old Testament. See Matt. 21: 42; John 5: 39; Rom. 1: 2; 4: 3. And thus the term is employed by Peter himself. 1 Pet. 2: 6; 2 Pet. 1: 20. Now, in 3: 16, the author says: "Which things" (things or topics contained in Paul's epistles,) "they wrest, as also the other Scriptures." Here he certainly

declares the Pauline Epistles to be inspired writings, forming a part of the canon of Holy Scripture, by putting them in the same class with the books of the Old Testament.

But it is unsuitable for one apostle thus to refer to the writings of another? "An apostle would never have done so," says the objector. (See also Calvin on 2 Pet. 3: 15.) *Why not?* "Because the apostles call the Old Testament Scripture, or Scriptures." True, *but does it follow from this, that they did not consider their own writings also inspired of God, and hence, equally deserving of the name Scripture?* It does not; for Paul claims inspiration for himself as pointedly as it is ascribed to him in this epistle. Gal. 1: 11, 12; Eph. 3: 3, 4; 1 Thess. 4: 15; 1 Cor. 14: 37; (compare 1 John 4: 6.) Now, if it was not unsuitable for Paul to claim inspiration for himself, how can it be unsuitable for Peter, in opposition to false teachers, to give his testimony to a fact so evident and unquestionable? And how could he do it better than by speaking of Paul's epistles as Scripture?

We have thus shown that the arguments of this able and distinguished man, against the genuineness of this epistle, are either mistaken in their assumptions, or that they fail to prove the point for which they are adduced. His assaults therefore, end only in smoke; no harm is done thereby to the canon of the New Testament. It stands like an impregnable tower, in which dwells "The Spirit of Truth."

III.—*The persons addressed.*

These are the same as those written to, in the first epistle, viz., Christians of Jewish and Gentile extraction, living in the five provinces of Asia Minor. 2 Pet. 1: 1; 3: 1, with 1 Pet. 1: 1. That Jewish believers are addressed in the first epistle, is evident from 1: 1; for the word "dispersion," *διασπορά*, when followed by a noun or nouns in the genitive, denoting nation, tribe, or community, is used to designate Jews dispersed among such na-

tions or tribes, as in John 7 : 35. (Comp. Jas. 1 : 1 ; Ps. 146 : 2, in the LXX., 147, 2, in the English version ; 2 Macc. 1 : 27 ; Judith 5 : 19.) But that Gentile Christians were also addressed, is clear from 1 Pet. 4 : 4, 5. Besides the provinces of Asia Minor were the great field of the labors of Paul and his helpers ; and that the churches of these provinces were composed both of Jewish and Gentile believers, is manifest, not only from the Pauline Epistles, but also from the Acts of the Apostles. And since 2 Pet. 3 : 1, makes it indubitable that this epistle was addressed to the same churches as the first, there can be no rational doubt respecting those for whom the epistles were originally intended.

They who contend that Jewish or Gentile believers are, in the first instance, exclusively addressed, are confuted by 2 Pet. 1 : 1 ; where the apostle says that he writes to those whose faith leans on the righteousness of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ ; which surely is a characteristic of true believers as such, without regard to national distinctions.

IV.—*The Scope of the Epistle.*

The chief design of the apostle is to assure them and us of the certainty of Christ's second coming as King and Judge ; and of the indispensable necessity of personal increasing holiness, on the part of those who profess to be believers, in order to share in the bliss of our Lord's everlasting kingdom ; also, to warn them and us against the wiles of false teachers, scoffers, and their followers, as well as to predict the awful doom which will overtake them when their judge has come.

A subordinate design, though an important one, is to give his dying testimony to the agreement of Paul with himself in the leading subjects of both epistles, and particularly of this epistle ; and to testify, in opposition to false teachers, that the great apostle of the Gentiles had been infallibly taught by the Spirit of

Christ. And the necessity of giving such a testimony is implied in 1 Pet. 5 : 12, compared with 1 Pet. 1 : 12.

V.—*The occasion and date of the Epistle. Peter's martyrdom at Rome.*

It is not necessary, as already intimated, to suppose that no false teachers, (having at least some of the features of those described in this epistle,) were at work among the churches in the five provinces at the time when Peter wrote his first epistle. For, in his former letter, 5 : 12, he intimates that errorists were at work, by assuring them that *that* epistle exhibits the true grace of God; or that it is an uncontaminated outline of the genuine gospel, agreeing with what Paul and his co-workers had taught them, 1 : 12. (Comp. 2 Pet. 3 : 15, 16.) Hence, also, he sent that letter to them by the hands of Silas. In the second epistle he predicts that false teachers shall arise with more unblushing impudence, and continue, (as it seems to us,) even to the end of the present dispensation, or down to the time of our Lord's personal arrival; 2d and 3d chapters. The zeal of such teachers in sowing tares appears either to have increased, after he had sent his first letter to the churches, or else the apostle had received more accurate information as to their doings; which induced him, by the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, to write this second epistle to "strengthen his brethren" against heresy, as he had written the first to arm them against persecution. The occasion of writing this epistle was accordingly furnished by the unholy zeal of false brethren; at least, this is the most probable hypothesis.

As to the date of the letter, it is not easy to decide. We know indeed that it was written shortly before the apostle's death, 1 : 14; but the place and time of his death have long been a subject of controversy among the learned. If he died at Rome, and by the order of Nero, it took place either in the year A. D. 64, or in the year A. D. 68; for these are the dates assigned by different

chronologists to the martyrdom of Paul, according as they assume one imprisonment of that apostle, or two. It matters little which opinion we embrace, for this is still an unsettled question. Schaff and Davidson contend for the former, Conybeare and Howson for the latter hypothesis ; to mention no others.

Since this matter comes directly in our way, it may be well to review the evidence as to our apostle's residence and martyrdom at Rome. There is no allusion to Peter's residence there in the epistles of Paul which were written from Rome, viz., those addressed to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon, and the second to Timothy. It is indisputable therefore, and is generally admitted by candid writers, that Peter's residence at Rome can not be proved from the New Testament, and that, if ever he did visit that city, he could not have arrived there until after the second epistle to Timothy was written.

But he may have arrived there after that time, and been put to death in the city. These are matters of fact or fiction, and they must be settled, if settled at all, by historical evidence. Other witnesses therefore must be heard, and first let us listen to *Clement of Rome*. (A. D. 70, or 96.)

In his epistle to the Corinthians,* chapters V. and VI., he writes thus: "But, to leave ancient examples, let us come to the *athletæ*, who existed quite recently. Let us take the noble examples of our own generation. On account of zeal and envy, the most eminent and upright pillars† were persecuted even unto death. Let us put before our eyes the excellent Apostles. Peter, on account of false zeal, endured, not one, nor two, but many hardships ; and thus, having given his testimony, (or, thus martyred, *ὁβρω μαρτυρ [ῆσας]*) he departed to the place of Glory that was befitting. On account of a like zeal," (literally zeal ; but Clement has just before defined the kind meant by using the descriptive adjective, "false ;") "Paul, also, received the prize

* Hefele's *Apost. Pat. Opera*. 3d edition.

† Gal. 2: 9.

of patience ; having borne chains seven times ; being banished, and stoned. After having been a preacher in the East and in the West, he obtained the noble renown of his faith ; having taught the whole world righteousness, and having come under the jurisdiction of the highest tribunal of the West, and given his testimony to (or, having been martyred by) the governors ; he thus, after having become the most eminent pattern of patience, was removed from this world, and departed into the Holy Place. (VI.) With these men, who had lived holily, there were crowded together [assembled, joined, or mustered, *τούτοις τῶις ἀνδράσιν . . . συνηθροίσθη πάλιν πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν*] a great multitude of the elect, who, on account of a like zeal, having suffered many indignities and torments, became a very beautiful example among us."

The English reader has now before him a literal version (one clause excepted) of that famous passage of Clement, about the meaning of which the learned have long and earnestly disputed. Clement, as it appears, in some degree even from this extract, is a writer somewhat florid, delighting in hyperboles, copious or prolix, but honest and zealous.

Some contend that he refers to the persecution in the time of Domitian ; others, as Dodwell and Wake, to the persecution in the reign of Nero. We think the latter more probable, because Clement is speaking of that persecution in which Paul and Peter were put to death, in company with a great multitude of Christians. "These men, who had lived holily," refers to Peter and Paul ; and the "great multitude of the elect," to the many believers who were put to death in the same persecution. And if so, the place of Peter's martyrdom was unquestionably Rome. Neither is 1 Pet. 5 : 13, an objection to this, if we suppose the apostle to mean, by "Babylon," Rome, considered as the headquarters of the then idolatrous and persecuting powers. Such an elliptical metaphor would be natural, if Peter wrote that epistle just before or after the Neronian persecution. And in

our judgment, the apostle does allude to it, 1 Pet. 4: 12-17. Silas, the bearer of the letter, as Schaff suggests, could explain it to those addressed. If so, we learn from the Apostle himself, that he was in Rome in the year 63, or 64, or in both.

The clause, of Clement, not literally translated above, is the following: *κα[τ' ἐπὶ] τὸ τελευτὰ τῆς δόσεως ἐλθών*. The *literal* version is: "*Having come to the limit of the West.*" Some understand by "the limit of the West," the city of Rome; but this is building a castle in the air. Others suppose that Clement intended to signify, thereby, Spain or England. Either of these countries, indeed, to Christians living at Rome in the first century, might well enough be considered as their "far west." But if Clement had designed to express such a thought,—for example, that Paul visited Spain,—he would not have blundered so as to use the participle, "*having come.*" In that case he would have said, "*having departed to the limit of the West:*" *παραθίζ,* not *ἐλθών*. This clause, therefore, furnishes no evidence that Paul fulfilled his intention of visiting Spain.

The preposition *ἐπὶ*, above rendered *to*, is not found in the manuscript of Clement's epistle, but was supplied to fill up the gap by the editor Junius. It is not clear, however, that he selected the very preposition originally employed by Clement. For Clement might have used *ὑπο*, "under." This mode of supplying what is wanting, was proposed by Wieseler, and is adopted by Schaff;* at least, he is favorably inclined to it. According to this suggestion, the version of the clause must be as follows: *Having come under* (the jurisdiction of) *the highest tribunal of the West*. In English, the word *term* (derived from *terma*, here used by Clement,) is employed in law, to denote "the time in which a court is held, or open for the trial of causes;" and there is no absurdity in supposing that *terma* is used here by Clement to designate the "Supreme Court" of the West. Paul appealed

* "History of the Apostolic Church," § 87, p. 342.

unto Caesar, and was tried by imperial authority at Rome ; or, as Clement says, "came under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court," that court beyond which appeals could no farther go ; that court which was the boundary, or limit of the then legal and judicial authority.

Dionysius of Corinth, in his letter to the Romans, testifies, that "Peter and Paul came into Italy, and suffered martyrdom there, about the same time." (Euseb. E. H., II., 25.) *Irenæus* says, "they founded the church of Rome," or established it more firmly on its foundations ; which, of course, implies that Peter must have been in the city. (Adv. Haer. III., 3: Euseb. E. H., V., 8.) The testimony of *Caius* is thus given by Eusebius: "If you will go to the Vatican, or Ostian Way, you will find the trophies of those who founded this church." "Happy church," exclaims *Tertullian*, "for whose benefit the Apostles poured forth their doctrine with their blood ! where Peter suffered like his Lord ; where Paul was crowned with martyrdom, after the manner of John" (the Baptist.) *Lactantius* says, that Peter came to Rome in the reign of Nero, and was by his order crucified, and Paul slain. (De Mort. Persec., cap. 2.) Indeed, this is the uncontradicted testimony of the ancients, and the fact, therefore, should be admitted. As to the fables that have been mingled with the fact of Peter's death at Rome, (such as his long residence in that city, and the ridiculous stories about his contests with Simon Magus,)' these are easily accounted for, and should not shake our belief of that in which all the witnesses agree.

Conybeare and Howson* seem to think that the testimony of the ancients as to this matter, is suspicious, because it might have originated in a desire to exalt unduly the bishops of Rome. But surely we may carry our skepticism too far ; and even if some of the ancients were swayed by such a motive, as is likely in what they said of the duration of Peter's residence in that city, and

* "Life and Epistles of Paul." Vol. 2, chap. 27, (note.)

his teaching there, still this would not demonstrate that his death in Rome is a fable; for in this particular there is no dissenting voice. Besides, those reformers, and their followers, who denied that Peter ever set his foot in the streets of Rome, and died there, may have been too much influenced by polemic zeal, as well as some of the ancients, by unhallowed ambition.

That Peter and Paul laid the foundations of the church at Rome, in the strict sense, is certainly a fable; and if *Caius* of Rome, and *Irenæus* intended so to testify, they either blundered grossly, or deliberately made a false statement; but why they should so foolishly perjure themselves, is unaccountable, when we recollect that any Christian might readily perceive, by reading Paul's epistle to the Romans, that a flourishing church, a church "whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world," (Rom. 1: 8,) existed in the city before the visit of either of the great apostles. It is fairer, therefore, to suppose that these ancient writers meant to say that they established it more firmly on the Rock, Christ. (Compare Rom. 1: 11.) The Papal assumption, however, that *Peter* was Bishop of Rome, or Pope, for twenty or twenty-five years, is a *pure fiction*, unsupported by credible testimony. Neither Clement of Rome, the most unexceptionable witness, nor Irenæus, nor Caius, nor Tertullian, nor Lactantius, so testify.* "This view also, contradicts the plainest facts of the New Testament, and cannot stand a moment before the bar of criticism." (See Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, § 93.)

On the subjects of this chapter, beside the authors already mentioned, *Lardner* may be consulted, in his "History of the Apostles and Evangelists," chapters XVIII., XIX., *Davidson*, in his Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. III., p. 354, etc., and *Neander*, in his Planting and Training of the Church, book

* Eusebius and Jerome first gave currency to this ridiculous story. How they enlarged their throats, so as to swallow such a camel, is hard to say. Perhaps their time-serving had something to do with it.

4, chap. 2. *Barrow* on the Supremacy of the Pope is the best work on that topic in English.

VI.—*The Integrity of the Epistle.*

This epistle, as we now have it, is contained in all the manuscripts and versions of the New Testament that have come down to us in a complete state; the old Syriac version excepted. Its uncorrupted preservation is, therefore, as certain as a fact of that kind can be. The same thing is demonstrated from the citations found in ancient authors. And yet, Bunsen* supposes that 2 Pet. 1: 1-11, with a brief doxology appended, is all that belongs to Peter! And, moreover, that the portion referred to is the short letter meant by the apostle, 1 Pet. 5: 12. But any unprejudiced man can see that, 1 Pet. 5: 12-14, is a postscript to the first epistle, and that the apostle mentions Silas as the bearer of that letter. Whatever may have been the gifts of Bunsen, no man more certainly stepped into the wrong boat than he did, when attempting to play the part of a theological or biblical critic. Ullman was a very different man, an able divine; and even he supposed that only the first chapter of the second epistle properly belonged to it! All the external or historical evidence is against such a hypothesis, as also the internal, as Hug† has irrefutably shown. In the analysis and exposition of this epistle, we have also proved the unity of design that runs through the whole of it, so that the attempt to tear it asunder must be branded as a perverse specimen of critical acumen, resting on mere caprice and conjecture.

VII.—*The term Catholic, or general, as applied to the epistle.*

In the fourth century, ecclesiastical writers were accustomed to call the epistles of Peter, James, John, and Jude, *Catholic*.

* "Hippolytus and his Age," Vol. I. London edition, 1854, pp. 24, 25.

† Intro. N. T., by Fosdick. § 178.

These seven epistles could not have been so called, because then “universally acknowledged,” for some of them were “controverted.”

The common explanation is, that they were so named, because not addressed to a particular church, but to many churches in general; encyclical letters, sent to Christians in various provinces or countries. James, certainly, wrote to Jewish believers in the dispersion; and Peter, to Christians, in different parts of Asia Minor; the first epistle of John also bears the stamp of an encyclical letter. So does the epistle to the Hebrews, although not so denominated by the ancients. The second and third epistles of John, however, though styled Catholic, by ancient authors, are letters addressed to individuals; not to a particular church, or churches. This appellation applies only to *most* of these epistles—not to all—and may have been the reason of their being so called.

Hug supposes that they were so named, in order to distinguish them from the Pauline epistles, and that the title, Catholic Epistles, was given them to denote epistles composed by the other apostles who were authors. His mode of reasoning, indeed, is not satisfactory, but the suggestion has internal verisimilitude. In speaking of the scriptures of the New Testament, the ancients needed convenient phrases as much as we do. It would be as natural for them as for us, when referring to the four biographies of Christ, to call them Gospel, or Gospels, or Evangelicon. And when speaking of Paul's epistles to style them ‘the Apostle,’ or Apostolicon; and, of the other epistles, most of which were written by apostles, and the rest by prophets or evangelists, to name them ‘Catholic epistles,’ or epistles composed by the other apostles and apostolic men. But as it is a matter of no practical importance, we may suspend our judgment, or embrace either of the opinions we prefer.

But whether the expression, “catholic epistles,” was employed by ancient writers to denote the persons addressed, or the authors

of the letters, it has no reference to the contents of the epistles. All of them arose from special occasions, had special aims or designs; they are by no means letters on general topics, or common places of theology, but particularly intended to refute theoretical and practical errors, and Antinomian licentiousness.

VIII.—*Analysis of the Epistle.*

I. *The introduction*: 1: 1-15. After the inscription and salutation, there is a general description of the abundant qualifications of the apostles conferred on them by Jesus our Lord, with the design of such gracious endowments in reference to men. 3, 4 vs.

An animated exhortation to the cultivation of constantly increasing holiness follows, enforced by the design of the apostolic office, as instituted by the Lord; also, by the fact that such progress alone demonstrates our confession of Christ to be unfeigned; and, from its indispensable necessity in order to a triumphant admission into Christ's everlasting kingdom. 5-11 vs.

The propriety of the Apostle's zeal in this matter, is shown from the fact that such admonitions and exhortations are not useless because well known; also, from the fact that such a course agrees well with the duty of an apostle, and especially of one near death; and, particularly, because of false teachers pronouncing apostolic instructions fables. 12-16 vs.

II. He thus opens up the way to prosecute his *chief design*, the certainty of Christ's second coming in power and glory as as King and Judge.

(A.) He shows that our Lord is indeed to come the second time, to establish his kingdom; first, from the Transfiguration of Christ, and the attestation of God the Father; secondly, from Scriptural Prophecy, which treats so largely of that coming and kingdom. 16-19 vs. To this a practical admonition is added, reminding us that since the Prophetic Word is not of human invention, but of divine original, we should receive its revelations

on this subject with attention, reverence and faith. 20, 21 vs. Thus he declares that Jesus our Lord is to come as King, and to reward his people.

(B.) He next predicts the rise of false teachers, who shall deny Christ's coming as Judge of the wicked. (2d chapter.)

Such will deny that their professed Redeemer is Lord and Judge; they will be crafty and avaricious in promulgating their self-contrived doctrines, gain many disciples, and so cause genuine christianity to be reproached; but they themselves, because of their sins, shall meet an awful doom from the Lord at the day of judgment. 2: 1-3, with 9 v.

Having thus briefly spoken of their characteristics, success and doom, he next demonstrates *the certainty of their punishment* in that day from former examples of God's retributive justice; *the certainty of the deliverance of the pious from a state of trial* is also intimated. 4-9 vs.

Then the apostle gives *a more particular description* of these false teachers, *repeating*, as he goes along, the *certainty* of their punishment, and illustrating its *justice*. 10-16 vs. Their characteristics are habitual indulgence of bodily appetites, and contempt of government; in which particulars they act more like brutes than men. Their covetousness is also prominent; in which, by constant drill, or habitual exercise, they have become such accomplished ministers of Satan that they hesitate not, like Balaam, to become teachers of idolatry and uncleanness; whose condemnation is just.

The future *everlasting* punishment of such teachers is also shown to be *just*, or richly deserved; first, because by empty pretences they deceive or disappoint the natural expectations of those who depend on them for religious instruction; secondly, because they tempt and lead to apostacy, by the promulgation of known falsehood and promised impunity, those professors who had fled for a time from the gross wickedness of their former associates; thirdly, because by thus turning away from the known

holy requirements of the gospel, and enticing others to do the same, they bring themselves and those whom they lead astray, into a condition and habit of life worse, in all respects, than any to which they had formerly been addicted; in this way preparing themselves and others for the prison of the incorrigible, which is hell. 17-22 vs. Thus the apostle shows that the Lord Jesus is to come as Judge to deliver the righteous from trial, to punish the unrighteous, and especially the false teachers.

(C.) *In the third chapter*, the apostle predicts *the rise of infidels*, whether in the visible church or out of it.

After commending again to their reverent and believing attention the prophetic scriptures, which treat so largely of Christ's coming as King and Judge, and the Apostolic Commandment in reference to holiness as absolutely necessary for the subjects of Christ's kingdom, he predicts that scoffers shall appear, who will deride our Lord's coming as a dream of fanatical and superstitious men, and, flinging away Holy Scripture, make their own lusts the rule of action. He thus portrays them as in truth infidels or skeptics. 3: 1-4.

He shows, in opposition to such, that their assumption of the uniformity of the course of nature is false in fact; the world having once been destroyed by the deluge, and that it is reserved for fire, when Christ comes to punish such ungodly sinners as they. 5-7 vs.

The apostle then directs his discourse to the pious, and assures them that length of time is no obstacle to the Lord, as to the accomplishment of his promised coming, and that he has good reasons for his apparent delay, viz., to promote their salvation, and to give all opportunities for repentance. 8, 9 vs.

This is followed by a prediction with respect to the physical change of our world, together with its renovation as the permanent dwelling-place of the righteous; an animated exhortation to the cultivation of the greatest degree of holiness being thrown in the midst of his description of the awful scene. 10-13 vs.

He thus predicts that Jesus our Lord is to come to punish infidels, as well as to save and honor his people.

III. *The Conclusion*, in which he exhorts them to make a wise improvement of the opportunities afforded them, that they may be found by Christ blameless and spotless ; and in which he likewise declares Paul's inspiration and agreement with himself as to the principal subjects of this epistle ; states also, the practical aim of his letter ; gives another exhortation to growth in grace and true knowledge of the gospel, the great subject of which is our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, whom he worships as worthy of present and eternal adoration. 14-18 vs.

COMMENTARY.

CHAPTER I.

¹ Simon Peter, a bondman, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them who have obtained equally precious faith with us in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ: ² grace and peace be multiplied to you in acknowledging God, and Jesus our Lord.

Here we have the inscription and apostolic salutation. By the expression, *bondman* (slave or servant) *of Jesus Christ*, some suppose that Peter describes himself as a saint or believer. And the phrase is so used, as in Rev. 1:1; Eph. 6:6; (compare 1 Pet. 2:16, 'God's bondmen.') Others take it as an official title, as in Gal. 1:10; Col. 4:12. The latter interpretation is preferable, since it is more natural to suppose that he alludes to his office as a minister of Christ; and it is confirmed by his adding "*an apostle of Jesus Christ.*" Bondman, as the more general title, precedes the other, and denotes his entire and willing consecration to the service of his Lord and Master.

The word *apostle* literally means one sent, or a messenger. John 13:16; 2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25. In Acts 14:14, it denotes an apostolical or inspired missionary; comp. Acts 13:1-4. Here it is used in the common official signification, to designate Peter as an extraordinary ambassador of the Saviour; one of the twelve called by Christ apostles. Luke 6:13.

The characteristics of the apostles are these: They were called or chosen by Christ himself, not by man, Luke 6:13; Gal. 1:1;

infallibly taught by the Holy Spirit to comprehend and make known “the word of truth, the gospel of our salvation.” John 16: 13; 1 John 4: 6; 1 Thess. 4: 8; Eph. 3: 3. They were competent witnesses as to the resurrection of Christ. Acts 3: 15; 1 Cor. 9: 1; 15: 15. The truth of their commission as our Lord’s envoys was demonstrated by miracles. Mark 16: 20; 2 Cor. 12: 12. They held the highest office our Lord ever gave to men, and were appointed by him to lay the foundations of the Christian Church by gathering and teaching disciples, appointing officers, and the general ordering and government of its affairs. Acts 6: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 5: 4–6; 12: 28; 2 Cor. 11: 28.

Peter in neither of his epistles calls himself “Chief of the Apostles,” “Chief Pastor,” “Universal Bishop,” or “Pope,” but a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, one of the same rank and office with the original twelve. If Christ had appointed him Pope over the apostolic college, and designed the bishops of Rome to succeed him in that office, it is inexcusable remissness in him never to give his readers the least hint of it, especially in the inscriptions of his epistles, and more particularly in this second epistle, designed to warn the churches against false teachers. On the contrary, he expressly recognizes Christ alone as “the Chief Pastor,” ruler or king, of the church and its officers. 1 Pet. 5: 4.

The persons addressed, are described as those *who have obtained equally precious faith with us*, etc.: *τοῖς λαχούσι*—to those who have obtained by lot, or received. Thus it is intimated “that their faith was the gift of God,” Eph. 2: 8.

Like precious faith, or, *equally precious faith with us*, *ἰσότημον ἡμῶν πίστιν*: the faith of the Christians addressed is called equally precious with that of the apostle, or the apostles generally; for the pronoun may refer to Peter, as in 1: 16,* or especially to

* We shall refer to the epistle on which we are commenting, simply by using the Arabic numerals.

Peter and Paul, as in 3 : 2, the sense remaining the same. Faith in Christ is called *precious*, costly, or valuable, because it is that by which we lay hold of the benefits of redemption, or become personally partakers of them ; and for another reason, viz. : because of its imperishable nature. So, our apostle says, “Your *faith*, much *more precious than perishable gold*,” 1 Pet. 1 : 7. In both epistles,* he mentions faith as precious ; but, in the first, he shows that he alludes thereby to its indestructible nature. Now, our Saviour prayed for Peter, that his faith might not utterly fail, Luke 22 : 32 ; if then, the faith of other true believers be not permanent or imperishable, it can not be said to be *equally precious* with Peter’s faith. The faith of private Christians, indeed, is alike precious with that of any of the apostles, inasmuch as it is the same in kind, in its effects, in its origin, its duration, and with respect to the foundation on which it rests for acceptance with God. But the chief scope of the apostle is to indicate the value of faith as arising from its permanency, and the immovable and perfect foundation on which it is built.

Accordingly, he says : “Equally precious faith *in the righteousness* of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.” The preposition, ἐν, must not be rendered “through,” for which Peter uses διὰ, 3, 4, vs., but *in, on, or leaning on*. This preposition is here used of the object on which a mental power acts, or of the ground on which, or the sphere in which, it is exerted. (Winer. Masson’s edition, pp. 404, 405.) So, 1 Cor. 4 : 6 : “That ye might learn *in us*,” *i. e.*, by fixing the mind, or attention on us as an example. John 13 : 35. “*In this*, all shall know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love *in one another* ;” *i. e.*, all by fixing their attention on this, namely, your love resting on one another, shall know that ye are my disciples. So, also, Xenophen : “Cyrus was *in*

* Such coincidences show that Peter is, indeed, the author of both epistles. No coincidence can be more natural and undesigned, than the one before us.

these things," or, he engaged in these matters by fixing all the energies of his mind on them. (Cyrop. 3: 11.) 1 Tim. 4: 15. "Be *in* these things," bring all your faculties to bear on them, or, "give thyself wholly to them." 1 Cor. 2: 5. "That your faith should not be *in the wisdom of men*, but *in the power of God*;" that your faith should not lean on human wisdom, but on the power of God. Rom. 3: 25. "Faith *in his blood*," faith resting on his sacrifice. Precisely so here: faith leaning on the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ: this is the object on which precious faith acts, the foundation on which it rests. (See, also, Gal. 3: 26; Col. 1: 4; 1 Tim. 1: 14; 2 Tim. 3: 15.)

The righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ: τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ἡσθεῖς Χριστοῦ. This, the marginal translation of the English Bible, is, in our judgment, the only accurate version. It is based on the following general rule: "When two or more personal nouns of the same gender, number, and case, are connected by the copulative καὶ, if the first has the definite article, and the second, third, etc., have not, they both relate to the same person." Our apostle's construction is certainly in conformity with this rule. Thus, 1: 11, "The everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Again, 2: 20: "In acknowledging the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" and in 3: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 3. Paul follows the same rule, Tit. 2: 13: "The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. 1: 3; comp. Jude 40.

But what is meant by the *righteousness* of our God and Saviour? Sin is ἀνομία, or lawlessness, 1 John 3: 4, and its opposite, righteousness, is a perfect conformity to God's law; "any want of conformity to, or transgression of, God's law, is sin," and *perfect obedience to it* is righteousness. (See Tholuck, Hodge, and Haldane on Rom. 1: 17.) So, it is used by Paul in the matter of our justification before God. Rom. 3: 21-22. And Peter shows that he agrees with Paul in this doctrine, by

declaring that faith leans on the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

This righteousness has been wrought out, not simply by a sinless man, but by Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour. It is the perfect obedience, in heart and life, to the divine law of "God manifested in flesh," as our legal representative; a righteousness of which "God in Christ" is both the author and approver; a righteousness imputed to every believer; and hence the perfect acquittal of such, is indisputable; a righteousness distinct from, but inseparably connected with, inherent sanctification or holiness. Thus we are taught, in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians. See, also, 2 Cor. 5: 19-21; Phil. 3: 9; 1 Cor. 1: 30.

Calvin says: "He calls faith *equally precious*, not because it is of the same degree in all, but because all possess the same Christ with his righteousness, and the same salvation by faith. Although, then, there is a disparity as to the degree of faith, yet this does not prevent all believers from having a knowledge of God, in common, nor hinder the fruit thence arising, so that we have a true communion of faith with Peter and the apostles."

Bengel: "Their faith is *equally precious* with those who saw Jesus Christ, as Peter and the rest of the apostles; and with those who believed without seeing him, since it lays hold of the same righteousness and salvation." 1 Jno. 1: 3; 1 Pet. 1: 8.

Burkitt: "Their faith is *like* that of Christ's apostle, as to its nature and quality, though not for its measure and degree; and *alike precious*, in regard of its object, Christ; in regard of its subject, the heart; in regard of its act, which is acceptance and consent to the terms of the gospel covenant; in regard of its effects and precious fruits, peace with God, peace with conscience, victory over the world, and the like. We see then, that the faith of the poorest believer is as precious as that of the richest, and that the weakest believer has the same precious faith with the strongest; and if it be alike precious, it shall be alike permanent and persevering."

Beza and McKnight say, that *the righteousness* here spoken of by the apostle, refers to God's faithfulness in fulfilling the Old Testament promise of extending faith and salvation to the Gentiles. But, this interpretation is based on two mistaken assumptions; first, that the words rendered, "Our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," refer both to the Father and the Son, whereas, the reference is to the latter. Our faith leans not on the righteousness of the Father, but on that of the Son, "God manifested in flesh." It is by His obedience that we become righteous in the sight of God. 2 Cor. 5: 19, 21; Rom. 5: 19. Second, they take it for granted that "righteousness," here, means faithfulness, which we deny, and cannot believe without clear and convincing proof.

"I, even I, am Jehovah, and beside me there is no Saviour;" thus speaks the Most High by Isaiah, 4: 3, 11; comp. 4: 5, 21, 22; Hos. 13: 4. Peter was well acquainted with such passages of Holy Scripture, and yet, he hesitates not to call "Jesus Christ our God and Saviour," and to declare that "there is salvation in no other," Acts 4: 12; demonstrating that the apostle considered our Lord truly God, as well as man. The unforced and perfectly natural manner in which this is done shows that his celebrated confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," sprung from the depths of his heart. (The same artless and forcible allusions to Christ's Godhead occur, also, in the first epistle, tending to prove that Peter is, indeed, the author of both. See 1 Pet. 1: 11; 2: 4.)

V. 2. The love of God, wholly undeserved by sinful men, is "*Grace*," the primal fount of every blessing, or every kind and degree of true happiness and prosperity, which is signified by the word "*Peace*." Luke 24: 36; 10: 5; John 14: 27; Rom. 3: 17. In the apostolical salutations, Peace corresponds to the Hebrew word, *Shālom*, the radical idea of which is soundness or completeness, (Gen. 29: 6,) and hence it means every sort of good. There is, however, a special allusion in these salutations to our

reconciliation or friendship with God, obtained by faith in the sacrifice of our Lord, (Rom. 5 : 1,) without which no true bliss or prosperity is attainable in time or in eternity. Hence Christ is called "Our Peace," *i. e.*, the author and procurer of it, Eph. 2 : 14-16 ; not only as destroying enmity among men, but also as reconciling us to God by his sacrifice offered on the cross. Accordingly the sense is: may God continue to remember you with the favor he bears unto his people, and since he is reconciled to you by the death of his Son, may every blessing that comes from God as "the fountain of Life," and through his Son as the Mediator, be richly bestowed upon you. Thus the *ordinary* formula of apostolic greeting is best explained, and in this explanation, at least in the substance of it, the most eminent commentators concur, as Calvin, Hodge, Olshausen, and Tholuck.

Grace and peace be multiplied to you *in acknowledging God, and Jesus our Lord*: ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. The general rule, stated before, does *not* apply here, since the article in the original is put both before "God" and "our Lord;" thus accurately describing both the Father and the Son as the persons of the Godhead, by the acknowledgment of whom grace and peace are multiplied to believers. Besides, in these salutations neither the Father nor the Son is ever mentioned separately, but together.

The noun ἐπιγνώσις means something laid upon or added to former knowledge, γνώσις; or "growth in knowledge," as our Apostle expresses it, 3 : 18. *Paul* generally employs it to denote full, increased, or more accurate knowledge. Rom. 10 : 2. "They have a zeal for God, but not according to accurate knowledge." Eph. 1 : 17, and 4 : 13 ; Col. 1 : 9, 10 ; Rom. 3 : 20. "For by the law there is a more accurate knowledge (or conviction) of sin." *Peter* uses the same term to express knowledge and confession, or, in a word, acknowledgment ; and that, whether it be true or false ; as here and in 1 : 3, 8 ; 2 : 20. Comp. 2 Tim. 2 : 25 ; Tit. 1 : 1. The reference here is to a true acknowledgment.

It is not enough to acknowledge God, and Jesus as *our Saviour*, unless he *in fact* saves or delivers us from our sins. Matt. 1 : 21. To talk, in any terms, of Grace and Peace as ours, without acknowledging, both in word and deed, the Father and the Son, is no proof of a sincere confession. The profession and the life must correspond. See Tit. 1 : 16 ; 1 Jno. 1 : 6 : 7. And our apostle here speaks of acknowledging “Jesus *our Lord*,” that is, not only as our Saviour, whose grace and mercy induced him to die for us, but who has thereby laid us under the most powerful and attractive obligations *to obey him*. And this addition to his former salutation, 1 Pet. 1 : 2, is in perfect keeping with the main design of this epistle.

Beza : “Faith is an acknowledgment of God and of Christ, from which all our happiness emanates.” This is a description of a genuine confession, or one arising from “faith unfeigned.” (See John 17 : 3, and *Alexander* on Isa. 53 : 11.) They, therefore, who deem a profession of the true religion a matter of little or no importance, and they who rest satisfied with a naked profession of it, are both, by this salutation of our apostle, tacitly but unmistakably reproved. Compare Rom. 10 : 9, 10.

³ As his divine power has given us all the things designed for, (or pertaining to) life and godliness, through our acknowledgment of him who called us by his own glory and excellency ;
⁴ by which exceeding great and precious promises have been given to us, in order that by these ye might become partakers of a divine nature, after having fled from the corruption that is in the world in consequence of lust.

Most commentators think that Peter here refers to effectual calling or regeneration, to the divine power as the efficient cause of it, and to the gospel as the means employed in producing it. Thus Calvin, Beza and Bengel, McKnight, explains both verses of the qualifications of the apostles, or the gifts of the Spirit imparted to them by Christ, in order to lead men to life and godliness. Benson thinks that the fourth verse has a special

reference to such apostolic endowments, and to the design of their office.

In our judgment, Peter is speaking here of the apostles only, but in a two-fold manner; first as believers, 3d v., and then as apostles, 4th v. To suppose that Peter is treating in this paragraph *only* of such gracious endowments of "the Spirit of Christ" as are common to all believers, is untenable. For this explanation overlooks the change of person, or rather the marked distinction between the first person and the second. For example: "To them who have obtained like precious faith *with us*," apostles. "As his divine power has given *us*," etc. "Who called *us*," etc. "That *ye* might become partakers," etc. "Grace and Peace be multiplied *to you*." "Moreover, for this very purpose add to *your* faith, virtue," etc. "*We*," apostles, "did not follow cunningly devised fables," 16th v. "*We* heard this voice," 18 v. "*I*," as an apostle, "think it right," etc., 13 v. To disregard this very marked distinction is decidedly objectionable; but this is done by those who affirm that the sanctifying gifts of Jesus our Lord are here alone referred to.

Besides, what can be more precisely adapted to the main design of this epistle, than to assume that here, in the exordium, Peter gives a general description of the apostles, considered both as genuine believers in Christ, and as his legates, richly furnished in order to guide others in the path of piety to eternal life? Thus the *holiness* of the apostles is tacitly contrasted with the *immorality* of the false teachers; and the *abundant qualifications* of Christ's legates, with the *empty pretences* of the apostles of Satan. The latter are wells without water, the former filled with the Spirit of truth and holiness. And it will be beyond the ingenuity of any to show how the apostle could have spoken in this place more to the point, or more modestly.

V. 3. A careful examination of the apostle's language will bring us to the same conclusion. The third and fourth verses contain the protasis; the apodosis begins at the fifth verse. *As*

his divine power has given us both the sanctifying and miraculous influences of his Spirit, that by these ye might be restored to the divine image, *do ye also* for this very purpose add to your faith, virtue, etc. *His* divine power : that is, the divine power of *Jesus our Lord* ; for the pronoun refers to the nearest antecedent, 2 v. This view is confirmed by that part of the subsequent context, the meaning of which is too transparent to be misunderstood : Fulfil your obligations to Jesus our Lord, by constantly advancing in holiness, for then your acknowledgment of him will not be in vain, 5-8 vs. Besides, our apostle is wont to ascribe sanctifying and miraculous gifts to the Holy Spirit, considered as "the Spirit of Christ." 1 Pet. 1 : 10-12 ; Acts 2 : 33. Thus "Jesus our Lord" exerts his divine power, as "our God and Saviour." 1 v.

The particle "*as*," *ὡς*, in itself considered, may mean *inasmuch as*, or *since* ; as in Matt. 6 : 12, "Forgive us our debts, *as* we too forgive our debtors," *i. e.*, inasmuch as we also forgive our debtors. The accuracy of this explanation of Matt. 6 : 12, is proved from Luke 11 : 4 : "Forgive us our sins, *for* we also forgive every one that is indebted to us." Or this particle may intimate that there ought to be an analogy or *likeness* between the zealous efforts of believers to become more and more holy, and the abundant means provided by our Lord and Saviour for that purpose ; and hence our translators have rendered it "according as." Either way, the main thought remains the same.

As his divine power has given us all things pertaining to life and godliness : literally : As of his divine power there has been given us all the things towards life and godliness. Now, if the genitive absolute, *τῷ ὁσὶ θεοῦ. δυνάμει δὲ θαρημύνης*, expresses *the efficient cause* of the gifts imparted, as is certain, then the particle *ὡς* (or "*as*") must have been used to denote the analogy or likeness before mentioned ; in a word, it must mean "according as." All the things pertaining to, *πάντα τὰ προϋ,* or all the things designed for. This phrase, in itself considered, expresses

the idea of general relation, or a general purpose, design, or intention. For example, Luke 14: 28-32: "For which of you purposing to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he has *the things designed for, or relating to perfection?*" τὰ πρὸς ἀπαρτισμόν; i. e., whether he has the means that are necessary for finishing the tower, or whether he has gold enough laid by which is designed to be spent for perfecting it. "Or else, while the other is yet far off, he sendeth an embassy, and desireth *conditions of peace*;" literally: "*he entreats the things towards peace*," relating to peace, or rather he entreats for such negotiations as are designed to establish peace between the contending parties. See also Acts 28: 10. In these passages the idea of general intention is more prominently exhibited; perhaps, in Rom. 15: 17; Heb. 2: 17; 5: 1, that of general relation.

The preposition *προς* literally expresses forward motion, *towards*. And if we now review our apostle's words, "As his divine power has given us *all the things towards* life and godliness, the phrase italicised is no longer of doubtful meaning, and the clause signifies *all the things designed for* the attainment of life and godliness; or all things which have relation to eternal life as the end, and piety as the way, to reach it. Or we may take "Life and Godliness," by hendiadys, for 'a godly life.' "As his divine power has given us all things designed to promote a godly life in us." This leaves the sense unchanged; for "without holiness no one shall see the Lord;" apostles not accepted.

But what was the means, or receptive organ, whereby the apostles became partakers of our Lord's purifying power? It was *through* (or by means of) *the acknowledgment of him who called us by his own glory and excellency*. Διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως = *through* (by) *the acknowledgment*: this, in our idiom, is *by our acknowledgment*. The person acknowledged is defined as "he who called us," etc., that is, Christ. And the calling meant is their effectual calling by Christ as his disciples,

and as his apostles. (This clause thus marks the transition to the subject spoken of in the fourth verse.) In both "Jesus our Lord" manifested "his divine power." Comp. Eph. 3: 7-20. Faith is that by which we truly acknowledge Christ, and by which his divine power works within us in purifying the heart; as our apostle also declares. Acts 15: 9.

Who called us *by his own glory and excellency*; ἰσχύος δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. This is the reading adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf, and found in the manuscripts A and C, and in the Vulgate; propria gloria et virtute. Griesbach also designates this reading as preferable, and it is approved by Calvin and Bengel. The other reading, found in B, G, K, is διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, = *Through, or by glory and excellency*. The former reading is decidedly preferable; but, either way, the sense is the same; for, if we adopt the latter, διὰ must be employed, as in Rom. 11: 26; 1 Cor. 8: 6.

Glory and excellency are used, by hendiadys, for *excellent glory*. *Glory* is here equivalent to *power*, for our Lord's divine power is the subject spoken of; by this the apostles were called. Thus, the word is used, Rom. 6: 4. "Christ was raised from the dead *by the glory* of the Father;" and by our apostle, 1 Pet. 4: 14: "*The Spirit of Glory* resteth on you," the almighty Spirit. Compare John 11: 40. *Excellency*: the Greek word literally means, goodness, or excellency of any kind. In 1 Pet. 2: 9, it denotes the divine perfections: "That ye should show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light." *Glory and excellency*, then, are equivalent to "his divine power," or an excellent exertion of it.

It deserves consideration, whether, by the apostolical acknowledgment spoken of here, Peter does not allude to the occasion which called it forth. "But whom do *ye*" (disciples) "say that I am?" "*Simon Peter*," the usual spokesman of the twelve, "answered, and said: *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" See Matt. 16: 13-19. Here, Peter, answering for the

rest as well as himself, acknowledged not only our Lord's human, but his divine nature; and our Saviour declared that acknowledgment of himself to be not the effect of human teaching, but of divine revelation or illumination, 17 v. Another apostle says: "Whoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ," in the sense just explained, "*is born of God.*" 1 John 5: 1, with 5 v.

The rendering given by our translators, "that hath called us to glory and virtue," cannot be justified for *δύα* with the genitive never means *to*. Into this unhappy mistake they seem to have been led by Beza: *ad gloriam ac virtutem*. The correct translation is given in the margin of the English Bible.

V. 4. *By which* [glory and excellency] *exceeding great and precious promises have been given to us*, etc., *i. e.*, by which excellent manifestation or exertion of his divine power, exceeding great and precious things promised by our Lord have been given to, or bestowed on us, the apostles of Christ. Here, the reference is especially to the extraordinary or miraculous gifts imparted to them. "Promises," by metonymy, for *the things promised*, as in 3: 4. "Where is the *promise* of His coming?" that is, Where is the fulfilment of that promise? See, also, Luke 24: 49; Heb. 10: 36. In Gal. 3: 22, as here, a promise is said *to be given* when it is fulfilled, or when the thing promised is given: "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that *the promise* by faith in Jesus Christ *might be given* to them that believe;" that is, that the thing promised, justification by faith in Christ might be actually conferred on believers. (Thus, Benson.) Comp. Gal. 3: 14. Moreover, how can *a promise be given by power*, except by *the fulfilment* of that promise?

That the exceeding great and precious things promised to the apostles, by our Lord, relate to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, is clear from many passages. For example, Luke 24: 49. "And behold, *I* am sending *the promise* of my Father upon you," etc.; that is, I will soon send upon you the Spirit promised by my Father. Compare Acts 1: 4, 8; Luke 21: 15. "*I*

will give you a mouth, and *wisdom*, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay, or resist;" comp. 2 Pet. 3: 15. "For ye are not the speakers, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you," Matt. 10: 20. "And *I* will ask the Father, and he shall give another Paraclete," (teacher, advocate and helper, and comforter,) "to abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth," etc., John 14: 16, 17. "But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, which the Father shall send in my name, *He shall teach you all things, and remind you of all which I have said to you,*" John 14: 26. "I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now; but, whenever the Spirit of Truth shall have come, *He will guide you into all truth,*" (or, the whole truth;) for he shall not speak of himself, but, whatever he shall hear, that shall he speak; *and he will tell you things to come.*" (Compare the whole passage, John 16: 7-15. See, also, Acts 1: 4, 5, 8.) "Verily, verily, I say *unto you*, He that believeth on me, *the works* that I do, shall he do also; and greater than those shall he do; because I am going to my Father. And whatever ye shall ask, in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it," John 14: 12-14.

Here we have a specimen of the exceeding great and precious things promised by our Lord to his apostles; and which Peter declares were actually given to them. These relate especially to their plenary inspiration by the Spirit of Christ; the wisdom given them, the revelation of future things, and of the true way of salvation, together with the miracles by which the Lord Jesus confirmed the truth of their doctrines, and the reality of their commission. (Compare Mark 16: 20; Rom. 15: 18, 19; 1 Cor. 2: 7-13; Gal. 1: 11, 12; 1 Cor. 14: 37; Heb. 2: 4; 1 John, 4: 6.)

The great design of bestowing such gifts is next stated: *In order, that, by these, ye might become partakers of a divine nature,* etc.; ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθὲ θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. The translation, "partakers of *the* divine nature," is altogether inaccurate, gram-

matically, violating the apostle's usage. *Here* the article is wanting in the original, but, in the third verse, it is found: literally, "the divine power of him" = His divine power. To partake of the divine nature is in itself impossible; for the distinction between God and intelligent beings, created and renewed by him, is infinite and impassable, and can never, from the very nature of the thing, be annihilated. If it could be, Pantheism would be true. But, to confound the Creator and the creature, and to make them all one and the same, is madness and blasphemy. "Nature," then, as here used by the apostle, cannot mean essence or substance, but disposition, moral qualities. And to become partakers of a divine nature, means to become partakers of a disposition like that of God; or like God, as to the combination of knowledge and holiness. See Eph. 4: 23, 24; Col. 3: 10. "*Partakers of his holiness*," Heb. 12: 10, and "partakers of a divine nature," are identical in signification. *That by these ye might become*, etc., *i. e.*, to the end that, by these promised gifts of the Spirit conferred on us apostles, ye might become renewed after the image of God. The great design of Jesus, our Lord, in giving us such wonderful endowments, says Peter, was to promote your holiness to the greatest possible degree. Comp. 1 Pet. 1: 15, 16.

Having fled from the corruption that is in the world, in consequence of lust: ἀποφυγόντες = having fled from, having escaped, *i. e.*, after ye have escaped, or fled from, as the same participle is rendered, 2: 20. It does not denote the means of becoming holy, as Bloomfield affirms; for that is indicated in the phrase, *by these*, (promises given to us.) Peter uses *corruption* in the sense of great wickedness, shameful immorality, 2: 12, 19. *The corruption in the world in lust*, is the literal rendering: τῇ ἐν νόσῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾷ. This corruption is shown on earth, it is in the world; or manifested by men of the world, the unrenewed; so that *world*, by metonymy, is put for its inhabitants. It is a corruption *in lust*; that is its fountain, or source, as Calvin

explains; or this corruption is *in consequence of* lust. So the preposition is used by our apostle, 1 Pet. 1: 6; 4: 14, 16; and 2 Pet. 2: 3. Or it may be equivalent to *consisting in*, as in 2: 7; but we prefer the former explanation.

The great design of the apostolical endowments will become more evident by giving a version more in accordance with the English idiom: "In order that by these, after ye have fled from the corruption that is in the world, in consequence of lust, ye might become partakers of a divine nature." Thus, it lucidly appears that this design is not only an avoidance of immorality with loathing, but also the acquisition of a disposition like that of God, in which knowledge, holiness, and bliss are inseparably united. (1 John 1: 5.) This thought, the apostle John would have expressed, after this manner: "In order that ye should not walk in darkness, but in the light, as God is in the light." 1 John 1: 6: 7; compare 1 Pet. 2: 9.

⁶For this same purpose, then, showing therewith all haste, supply, with your faith, boldness; and with boldness, knowledge; ⁶and with knowledge, self-mastery; and with self-mastery, steadfast endurance, and with steadfast endurance, godliness, (or, piety;) ⁷and with godliness, love of the brethren; and with love of the brethren, philanthropy. ⁸For, if ye have these things, and they abound, they make you stand neither idle nor unfruitful, as to the acknowledgment of our Lord Jesus Christ. ⁹For he who has not these things is blind, shutting the eye, forgetful of the purification of his old sins. ¹⁰Wherefore, brethren, hasten the more to make firm (or, sure) your calling, and so (your) election; for, doing these things, ye can in no wise stumble at last. ¹¹For thus an entrance shall be richly supplied for you into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Peter, having given a brief description of the qualifications of the apostles for their work, consisting in the sanctifying and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; and, having stated the great design of their office, as instituted by the Lord Jesus,—viz., to restore men to the moral image and likeness of God,—now exhorts them to use the most earnest efforts to this end, in connection with

the means and agencies thus provided for them, so that a beautiful, progressive, and holy consistency might be conspicuous in their temper and conduct, 5-7 vs. And this exhortation is also enforced by other powerful and attractive motives, 8-11 vs.

V. 5. *For this same purpose, then, etc.* *καὶ ὁτι τοῦτο δι: εἰς* is understood before *ὁτι τοῦτο*. Now, although *καὶ δι:* is often equivalent to *also*, and might have been translated so here, without changing the sense; yet *δι:*, here, is continuative, and *καὶ* is used to introduce the apodosis, as is common. In such instances, the English idiom requires the use of *then*, or *therefore*; or, *and then*; *now then*. "As his divine power has given *us*, etc., *now then*, do ye *also* supply," etc. In Rom. 9: 17; Col. 4: 8, *εἰς* is put before *ὁτι τοῦτο*. Peter omits it, but employs the expression in the same signification. In Gal. 2: 10; 2 Cor. 2: 3; Phil. 1: 6, Paul also omits *εἰς*, though in these instances *ὁτι τοῦτο* is dependent on a verb, so that Conybeare's version of the phrase, "accordingly," is hardly allowable. (Thus, he renders it in Gal. 2: 10; Phil 1: 6; but in 2 Cor. 2: 3, "for this very reason.") The interpretation now given is adopted, in substance, by Calvin, Bengel, Benson, McKnight, Doddridge, and others. *Εἰς ὁτι τοῦτο*, prout placet Œcumenio.* The other reading, *καὶ ὁτι τοῦτο*, A, leaves the sense unchanged, but, as the easier one, looks like a correction.

For this very purpose, viz., to escape the corruption in the world in consequence of lust, and to become partakers of a divine nature; *then, or therefore*, introduces the apodosis, and intimates the consequence that should follow as to our behavior. "As Jesus, our Lord, has bestowed exceeding great and precious promised gifts on us, the apostles, in order to promote your holiness to the greatest degree, for the accomplishment of this design in your case, do ye, *therefore*," etc. *Showing, therewith, all haste, supply with your faith, excellency.* ↓ The participle,

* Thomas Smith: Commentarius in Secundam S. Petri Apostoli Epistolam.

παρετενέγκαντες, is found only here in the New Testament, and the literal translation is, "Having brought in beside," or "bringing in alongside of." *All haste* is equivalent to the greatest zeal, or, the most earnest efforts. Thus, our apostle intimates that their utmost efforts must be used in connection with the inspired word, spoken or written, of the apostles. Compare 1 Pet. 1: 23-25, and 2: 1-3; 1 Pet. 1: 14-16; John 17: 20, 21. A participle is employed by Peter, with a verb in the imperative mood following, or preceding, to indicate the manner in which a duty enjoined is to be done, 1 Pet. 2: 1; 1: 13. "*Supply* with (or, add to) your faith, excellency," etc.; how? *by exhibiting the greatest diligence*: the sense, then, is, Show the utmost zeal in endeavoring to furnish yourselves with these virtues.

Supply, that is, desire and endeavor to do so: ἐπιχορηγῶσατε. In classic writers, the verb sometimes means to lead out a chorus; also, to pay the expenses of getting up a chorus, and hence to supply or furnish, as here and in the eleventh verse. That no special stress must be laid on the preposition in this verb, is clear, from the adverb, "richly," prefixed to it in the same verse. The simple verb is used, 1 Pet. 4: 11; comp. Gal. 3: 5; 2 Cor. 9: 10. Doddridge's explanation as if the apostle meant to personify the virtues mentioned, they being led up as in a dance, is far-fetched and repugnant to Petrine and Pauline usage. To suppose the allusion in the phrase ἐπιχορηγῶσατε ἐν to be a foundation is better; for ἐν is sometimes equivalent to *on*, leaning on, as in 1: 1. The preposition, however, has often the same signification as in connection with, or with, as in 1 Pet. 3: 2. Furnish or equip yourselves with these virtues; do not rest satisfied with faith only, but exert your highest zeal to supply excellency, etc., or, make haste and add one to the other. The version in common use gives the sense remarkably well; "giving all diligence, add to," etc.

Excellency, ἀρετή, in the third verse means *power*. Here it denotes *boldness*, or moral power. *Supply with your faith*,

power, signifies that to confidence in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, (1: 1,) we must add an energetic discharge of duty, laughing at danger and throwing aside all stumbling blocks in our way. This power is necessary for growth and consistency in holiness. Thus Benson, Scott, Barnes, and others. This excellency, or moral power, does not differ much, or at all, from what Peter elsewhere calls *a girding up of the loins of the mind*, 1 Pet. 1: 13. The assumption that the word here means "virtue," in the ordinary sense, has never been proved, though advocated by Calvin and Warburton. The Latin *virtus*, in the sense of manliness, bravery, or that which becomes a hero, is more like ἀρετή here; and if the word "virtue" in the English Bible were so understood, it would be unexceptionable; but it is not by the unlearned. Christian manliness or heroism is the virtue here meant by the apostle; a bold discharge of duty amidst danger and difficulty, as becomes a good soldier of Christ.

And with boldness, knowledge: the knowledge here meant is both theoretical and practical; or an increasing acquaintance with the gospel, and prudence, which is practical knowledge. That your boldness may not degenerate into rashness, grow in the knowledge of your duty to Christ, (3: 18,) and do not foolishly put yourselves in the way of danger, Matt. 10: 23. Many, in the Ante Nicene church, forgot or disregarded this precept of Christ and his apostle, or they would not have courted martyrdom as they did. And they equally forget or disregard this apostolic precept, who are mere passive recipients of evangelical knowledge, not searching the Scriptures for themselves, as the Bereans did. Acts 17: 11.

V. 6. And with knowledge, *self-mastery*: τῇ ἐγκράτειαν = *inward strength*, self-government, rule over one's spirit, mastery of one's evil inclinations. Prov. 25: 28. The word "temperance," as now commonly used, does not give the sense of the Greek word. (Compare Acts 24: 25; Gal. 5: 22.) Since the word

strictly means dominion over our sinful desires, chastity is of course included, and may also be particularly intended by our apostle; yet the government of all our evil passions is the preferable explanation, since thus we are commanded to strangle all the hissing vipers within us.

And with self-mastery, *steadfast endurance*: $\tau\eta\lambda' \delta\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\gamma\eta\gamma = a$ *staying under*, literally; hence, patience, perseverance, or steadfast endurance. While attempting to govern yourselves, do not become discouraged, but *persevere* until you conquer. Our apostle may also refer to outward calamities, and then the sense is: Tame your passions raging within, and bear up under troubles arising from external circumstances; and this we prefer.

And with steadfast endurance, *godliness* (or piety): $\tau\eta\lambda' \epsilon\delta\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu$. The word means reverence towards God mingled with love, or the worship that is properly due to him. Be constantly engaged in adoring God and entreating his help, for so your daily struggles for self-government and resignation will be crowned with success. To assume that Peter here speaks of piety in the sense of reverence and affection due to kindred and friends, as some do, is altogether forced, since it is opposed to usage, marked and uniform. See Acts 3: 12, where Peter is the speaker, and the same word is used, though the common version has "holiness." "As though by our own power or godliness," etc. 1 Tim. 2: 2; 3: 16; 2 Tim. 3: 5; Tit. 1: 1, etc. (The cognate verb is only once used to express the idea of filial piety. 1 Tim. 5: 4.)

V. 7. And with godliness, *love of the brethren*, or brotherly love: the love referred to is a fervent, practical love, shown to one because he is a child of God and a brother in Christ. Comp. 1 Pet. 1: 22, and 4: 8; Heb. 6: 10. *Charity* or *Love*, as distinguished from brotherly love, means *philanthropy*, or love to man as man, shown by benevolence and beneficence.

V. 8. The apostle, having enforced the exhortation to growth in holiness from the great design of the apostolic office as insti-

tuted by our Lord, now proceeds to present another motive to the same end. With the greatest diligence, add to your faith, boldness, etc., for these virtues, if they exist in you and abound, will make it manifest that your confession of Christ is sincere. *For if ye have these things*, these virtues or graces of the Spirit which I have just mentioned, *and they abound*, or increase more and more: literally, For these things existing and abounding to you; but here the participles are used to express a condition, as in 1 Pet. 3: 6, and being joined with the dative of a person, they imply possession; hence the version in our idiom is, "If ye have these virtues, and they abound."

For these things, if they be yours and abound, *cause you to stand*, etc.: $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha$ (sc. $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$) $\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\iota$. The verb is transitive, and means, literally, to *set down*, *cause to stand*. (Comp. 1 Pet. 5: 12.) This, our translators take as a metaphorical expression, equivalent to *make you to be*; but it is difficult to see how such a version can be justified. When we set down a person, or make him stand in any assembly, we thereby *cause him to appear*, *we make him conspicuous*, so that he naturally attracts the attention of the company. We think therefore, that the best mode of interpretation is the following: By exhibiting the greatest diligence, add to your faith, boldness, etc., for these virtues, if they be yours and abound, cause you to appear in the eyes of all beholders, (1 Pet. 3: 2,) not as persons that are inactive and unfruitful in the acknowledgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2: 21. Or, growth in these virtues makes it manifest that your profession of Christ is sincere. Besides, it is tautological and absurd to say that growth in these graces of the Spirit makes one to be not idle and unfruitful in knowing and confessing Christ. They who grow in holiness are not unholy professors!

Neither idle nor unfruitful as to the acknowledgment, etc.: Ἀργός = *idle*, lazy or slow, Matt. 20: 3-6; 1 Tim. 5: 13; Tit. 1: 12. This word, in the English Bible, is here only rendered "barren," but in the margin "idle." It here signifies *slothful*,

inactive, indisposed to do the work which Jesus our Lord has commanded. "Ye are my friends if ye do whatever I command you." John 15: 14. To suppose the metaphor to be in the word idle, is to introduce an unseemly tautology; for barren trees are unfruitful ones; the metaphor lies only in the latter word. The expression, "not slothful nor unfruitful," expressed in a positive form, is the same as active and fruitful. These virtues, if they be yours and abound, will cause you to be noticed by others, and then you will not be branded by them as idlers in Christ's church, or as trees in his vineyard that yield no fruit. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify you Father who is in heaven." Matt. 5: 16. "That they may, by beholding some of your good works, glorify God in a day of visitation." 1 Pet. 2: 12, Gr. This interpretation is farther confirmed from the fact that Peter uses the cognate verb to express an idler's gait: "Against whom the judgment long since [threatened] *lingers not*," οὐκ ἀργέι, comes not "with lingering steps and slow," as a slothful person walks. *T. Smith*: Absque harum virtutum praxi et copia, professio Christi quam præ vobis fertis, nec vobis nec aliis utilis futura est. The various reading, παρουντα A. and Vulgate, leaves the sense the same as υπαρουντα, B. C. G. K.

V. 9. *For he who has not these things*, etc.: ὅς γὰρ μὴ ἄρρζει ταῦτα,=whoever has them not; or, if any one have them not. If they should not be present to any one, as I now suppose or assume: this is intimated by the use of the subjective negative. If any one is destitute of these virtues, (which may be taken for granted without loss of charity) he *is blind*; his ignorance and stupidity in the matter I am urging is unquestionable. And he must be indeed blind who sees not the necessity of holiness, and growth in it, for admission into Christ's kingdom. John. 3: 19-21; Rom 8: 13; Tit. 2: 11-15. The other metaphorical expression, μυαπάζων = *shutting the eye*, or *winking*, is considered by our translators as meaning one that cannot see afar off, a near-sighted person.

And the word is used by classic writers in this sense, ‘dim-sighted,’ or ‘short-sighted.’ *Thomas Smith*: *μωπάζων* luscitiosus est. Ita *μώπωα* interpretatur Gellius (Noc. Att. 4: 2.) *Luscitiosus sive lusciosus, ut Attæius Philologus explicat apud Festum, est, qui propter oculorum vitium parum videt*: vel saltem quod paulo remotius est, non videt. *Μωπάζειν* dicuntur ab Aristotele apud Budæum. *οὐ ἐκ γενετῆς τὰ μὲν ἐγγύς βλέποντες, τὰ δὲ ἐξ ἀποστάσεως οὐκ ὀρῶντες.* The near-sighted almost shut their eyes, or contract their eyelids, when attempting to look at a distant object; and hence this signification of the word is quite natural and obvious. The participle thus explained must be considered as restricting the meaning of the term blind: ‘I do not intend to say that such a man has no knowledge at all of the necessity of holiness, but that his knowledge in this particular is very imperfect and inaccurate: such a knowledge as a short-sighted person has of a distant object.’

Others explain the participle of voluntary blindness, or wilful moral stupidity. “For he who has not these things is blind, *shutting the eye*,” *i. e.*, wilfully closing his eyes against the light. Thus Benson and McKnight. This explanation is consistent with the literal meaning of the word, but not with the *usus loquendi*.

Lachmann and Tischendorf do not put a comma between the two words, but join them together, and then the version must be, “He who has not these things is *a blind eye-shutter*,” or “a blind winker;” a sluggard who is ever willing to shut his eyes and slumber; or, when the figure is interpreted, a stupid and careless professor, to whom the precept of the gospel, demanding constant progress in holiness, is unwelcome. Such an one willingly goes to sleep in his sins, shutting his eye against the light, because he hates it. Comp. John 3: 20. Whichever interpretation we adopt, the *blindness* meant must be considered *voluntary*. “Darkened as to the understanding, being alienated

from the life of God *through the ignorance that is in them, on account of the hardness of their hearts.*" Eph. 4: 18.

Wishing to forget, or forgetful of the purification of his old sins: literally, "seizing (or taking) forgetfulness in respect of the purification of his old sins." As to the expression, seizing or taking forgetfulness, it may be a pleonasm, designed to describe more emphatically the forgetfulness spoken of; or, there may be no emphasis in the phrase, as in Heb. 2: 3, "Which *began* to be spoken by the Lord," literally, 'which *taking* its *beginning*,' etc. Occasionally, however, such forms of speech are used to denote the consent of the will and an eagerness to perform the act indicated, as in Rom. 7: 8-11; "Sin taking occasion," or rather, "seizing the opportunity;" and perhaps, 2 Tim. 1: 5. So it may be explained here, wishing to forget, eager to do so. But if it be pleonastic, then the sense is, "forgetful of the purification of his old sins." And *old sins* means sins formerly committed; or, as it is expressed in the first epistle, "*former lusts* in your ignorance." 1 Pet. 1: 14.

The *purification*, καθάρσιμος, meant is Baptism. The thing signified by baptism, to wit: inward cleansing, is put, by metonymy, for the outward sign or symbolical action that represents it to the eye. (This inward purification, or regeneration, is shown by an honest and conscientious desire to please and obey God, and this is the only baptism that saves, namely, the outward and inward one combined. 1 Pet. 3: 21.) "A question arose between some of John's disciples and the Jews about *purification*. And they came to John, and said to him, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same *baptizeth*, and all come to him." John 3: 25, 26. Comp. Acts 22: 16; Rom, 6: 3-6. Our apostle elsewhere in like manner takes it for granted that one may be so far brought under the influence of the gospel as, for a time, to avoid gross sins and acknowledge Christ, and yet practically forget the obligations voluntarily assumed at his baptism, 2: 20-22. The sense then is:

‘Be in earnest to cultivate these virtues, for whoever is destitute of them is morally stupid, and wilfully so; practically forgetful of the confession made and the obligations to holiness acknowledged at his baptism.’

The apostle is not speaking in this verse of a backslider, or a believer in a low and declining state; for the person spoken of is expressly described as one who *has not* the virtues mentioned, 5-7 vs.; as one who is willingly blind in reference to the truth he is insisting on, viz., the necessity of progress in holiness; as one who, by returning to sins formerly committed, shows that he forgets, or strives to forget, the obligations of his baptismal confession and covenant. How absurd to suppose that one can be destitute of holiness, and yet at the same time have it; can love the light and yet hate it!

V. 10. *Wherefore, brethren, hasten the more to make sure [or firm] your calling, and so [your] election; for, doing these things, ye can in no wise stumble at last.* Wherefore, *ὁὖ*: this refers to what is said in the ninth verse. To avoid that dreadful state of wilful moral stupidity and return to sins formerly committed, *hasten the more*, or employ still greater earnestness and diligence. *To make one's calling sure* or firm, is to assure one's self by unquestionable evidence of his regeneration, or effectual calling.

But how is this evidence to be acquired? Not by living on variable frames and feelings, not by confounding comfort with holiness, but by *doing these things*, or cultivating the graces before mentioned. It is the present participle, and the sense is: For, if ye constantly practice these virtues, or, By practicing them. The unmistakable and decisive proof of our effectual calling is our progressive sanctification; any acknowledgment of Christ not attended by these graces of the Spirit, is worthless. Make sure your calling, *and so (your) election*: Assure yourselves in this manner of your regeneration, and so of the fact that God has chosen you as his people. (Comp. 1 Pet. 1:12; Rom.

8: 28. "The called according to his purpose," *i. e.*, those regenerated agreeably to the previous intention of God. 2 Thess. 2: 13, 14.) The copulative *and*, *καί*, is often equivalent to *and hence*, *and then*, or *and so*; denoting a consequence. Matt. 11: 18, 19, "*And hence* they say, he has a demon." John 7: 22. "*And hence* on the Sabbath ye circumcise a man." Rom. 11: 35. "Who has first given unto him, *and then* it shall be recompensed to him again?" 1 Pet. 5: 4. "*And then*, when the chief Pastor has appeared," etc. If ye constantly practice these virtues, ye may be sure that you have been called by God, and hence you may be certain of your election by him; or, that ye are the called according to his purpose.

The purpose or choice of God, in reference to the salvation of any one, can be known only by his manifesting it in some way. He does it by effectual calling; and when we become partakers of a divine nature we increase in all the graces of the Spirit, adding to our faith boldness, and the rest. Sanctification of the inner man, exhibited in the fruits of holy living, shows that our calling is indeed of God's Spirit, and so demonstrates that God has chosen us as his. Comp. 2 Tim. 2: 19.

For, doing these things, *ye can in no wise stumble at last*; οὐ μὴ πταίσῃτε ποτε. "For, if ye constantly practice these virtues, ye cannot fail of success hereafter; or, thus your future everlasting well-being is certain." The objective or absolute negative, and the subjective or relative one are both used by the apostle: οὐ μὴ = *not at all*, *in no wise*, as in John 4: 14, and 6: 37; 1 Pet. 2: 6: ποτε, here, certainly refers to the future, and may be rendered either *hereafter*, or *at last*. The aorist subjunctive, πταίσῃτε, with the negatives that modify it, the moral impossibility of failure on the condition mentioned, and then the translation must be either as above given; or thus: *ye shall in no wise stumble at last*. (Compare in the original, 1 Pet. 1: 7. "That the proving of your faith *must be found*, (or, *shall be found*,) ending in praise," etc. Heb. 1: 6 "But when he *must again*

(or, *shall again*) *bring in*," etc. 1 Pet. 4: 13. "Ye must be glad, leaping, or shall exultingly rejoice.") This verb is found elsewhere, only Rom. 11: 11; James 2: 10; and 3: 2; comp. Jude, 24 v. James employs it in the sense of to sin, or stumble in the path of duty; but this signification is not appropriate here; for the words that immediately follow show, that the apostle alludes to the ultimate result of holy obedience to Jesus our Lord. "If ye persevere in holy living, ye can in no wise be in the wrong path, and at last stumble and fall into hell, for thus an entrance," etc.

The context, therefore, leads naturally to the interpretation given, and the verb is so used by Xenophon. Cyr. 3: 1, 26. "I think it is a peculiarity of this man to be insolent *when prospering*, and quickly to crouch through fear *when stumbling*; i. e., when failing of success, or stumbling while in the pursuit of good. Jude, 24 v: "To him who is able to keep you *from stumbling*, and to make you stand before his glory, blameless with exultation:" ἀπαίστατον; i. e., to Him who is able to keep you from ultimately failing of success, and cause you to appear before his glorious presence with holy exultation.

The reading adopted by Lachmann, "Hasten the more, to make sure, *by your good works*," etc., is found in A. and the Vulgate; but it is omitted by B. C. The evidence for it is slight; it was probably, at first, a marginal explanation of some copyist. The addition is certainly tautological, or superfluous, because there immediately follows, "*doing these things*," etc. We may be sure, therefore, that Lachmann's addition, taken from only one manuscript, forms no part of the apostle's original text.

V. 11. *For so an entrance shall be richly supplied for you into the everlasting kingdom*, etc. *So or thus*: in this manner, only, that is, clothed and adorned with these virtues, or by doing these things. This by no means proves that our virtues merit or deserve such a reward; but it shows that none give the evidence to others, or can be certain themselves, that they are called effect-

ually, and, consequently, chosen of God, except those who partake of a divine nature; or, that the *only* way into the kingdom is the highway of holiness. Isa. 35: 8-10; 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10; Eph. 5: 5; Jas. 2: 5. Besides, the form of speech employed, "*So an entrance shall be richly supplied for you,*" or abundantly furnished you by God, of itself implies that his grace is to be very conspicuously exhibited, both in enabling us to persevere in holy living, and to reign with Christ in unspeakable glory. *Calvin*: "The apostle explains *the mode of perseverance*, when he says, 'An entrance shall be abundantly supplied for you;' the sense of which is, God, by largely and repeatedly furnishing fresh supplies of grace, will lead you all along, until you enter his kingdom."

* *The everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* The kingdom here meant, is *not that kingdom* which, as the Word, or Logos, or as God cœqual and cœternal with the Father, he had from eternity; and which, from the very nature of the thing, must be eternally His, in union with the Father and the Holy Spirit; one indivisible God with one indivisible kingdom, the Universe. 1 Chron. 29: 11. "Thine, Jehovah, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heavens and on earth is thine: thine is the kingdom, Jehovah, and thou art exalted Head over all." Compare Ps. 103: 19-22, and 145: 10-13. As Jehovah, therefore, this kingdom belongs to the eternal Son by indefeasable and inalienable right.

But the kingdom intended by the apostle is that which belongs to him as "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," or his kingdom considered as Mediator between God and man. It is termed "the kingdom of heaven;" a kingdom heavenly or divine in its origin and administration; and "the kingdom of God." (The source of such forms of speech will be found in well-known passages of the prophet Daniel.) It is also called "the kingdom of Christ," and here, "the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour

Jesus Christ." Matt. 3: 5; 6: 33; 7: 21; 19: 24; Mark 1: 14, 15; Luke 4: 11; 9: 1; John 3: 3, 5; (Luke 22: 30; John 18: 36. "My kingdom.") Eph. 5: 5, "the kingdom of Christ." Col. 1: 13, "the kingdom of His beloved Son." 2 Tim. 4: 1, 18; Heb. 1: 8; Rev. 11: 15. "The kingdom of God," means the Divine kingdom of Christ; as "the kingdom of heaven" means the heavenly kingdom of our Lord, as Paul expresses it, 2 Tim. 4: 18. And the kingdom of our incarnate God and Lord is thus named, as above said, because it is divine or heavenly in its origin, and administration. "My kingdom is *not of this world*," John 18: 36, that is, it does not derive its origin from human appointment; the rule of its administration does not spring from human policy. "I appoint a kingdom for you, *as my Father appointed it for me*." Luke 22: 29.

Now, this mediatorial kingdom of Christ, this kingdom which is peculiar to him as "God manifested in flesh," is set before us in the New Testament as both *present* and *future*. *His present kingdom, as the incarnate God, is two fold: First*, the visible church of Jesus Christ is the divinely constituted, or heavenly appointed, form of his kingdom now, to last until his second coming. The subjects of this kingdom are men both renewed and unrenewed; all, however, acknowledging, whether feignedly or truly, Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour. Matt. 13: 37-43. "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels," (at the consummation of the age, at the end of the present dispensation of his grace,) "and they shall gather *out of his kingdom* all the stumbling blocks and those doing iniquity." Here, our Saviour is speaking of the visible church, as it will appear, when he comes; in it there will be up to that time "stumbling blocks," professors leading others to sin, or to stumble in the path of duty; of which stumbling blocks false teachers are most influential. Rom. 15: 17. In this church there will also be up to that day "them that do iniquity," or who live in the habitual indulgence of their sinful propensities. Such are not indeed, strictly speaking, chil-

children of the kingdom, but yet they outwardly appear as such, having a form of godliness while denying the power thereof. The phrase "his kingdom," then, in Matt. 13: 41, denotes Christ's visible church, with wheat and tares in it; but when he shall send forth his angels to separate the one from the other, "*then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father;*" or then the future form of his kingdom, to which both Christ and they who are Christ's were appointed by the Father, (Luke 22: 39; Matt. 25: 34,) shall be established in ineffable glory.

"Who delivered us from the power of darkness, *and translated us into the kingdom of his beloved Son,*" (Col. 1: 13;) i. e., who, by regenerating us delivered us from the authority, ἐξουσία, of Satan the prince of darkness, and set us over, or removed us into, the church of Jesus Christ. Compare Col. 4: 11.

Secondly. Our Lord's present kingdom as the incarnate God, consists in his association as such, with the Father in the government of the universe, and especially of the heavenly worlds. Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour is now "at the right hand of the Majesty on high," seated on his Father's throne, (Rev. 3: 21,) "angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him," (1 Pet. 3: 22,) "Lord both of the dead and living," Rom. 14: 9. He has the keys of the spirit-world and of death, Rev. 1: 18. The great design of this form of his kingdom is indicated, (Eph. 1: 10; Phil. 2: 9-11,) viz., that he may be acknowledged as the incarnate Jehovah by all intelligent beings in all worlds, and that all the saints, in heaven and on earth, may hereafter be gathered together into one kingdom under him as the head.

His *future* kingdom as God-Man Mediator, is here spoken of by our apostle; for it is a kingdom into which they had not yet entered, and hence it cannot mean Christ's visible church: "For so an entrance *shall be richly furnished you* into the everlasting

kingdom," etc. This future form of the kingdom of Christ in which "*the righteous shall shine as the sun*," will be instituted at our Lord's second coming. This is manifest from the main drift of this epistle, and the certainty of Christ's powerful coming to admit the holy triumphantly into it, is shown in the latter part of this chapter, (16-19 vs.) "*His appearing and his kingdom*," (2 Tim. 4: 1,) must mean when he appears again to establish his kingdom. And, from the explanation which the King himself gave of the parable of the tares of the field, it is indisputable that the good and bad will exist in the visible church until the separation is made by his order at "the consummation of the age," or end of the present dispensation. "*Then the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father*;" which passage has been before explained. See also Matt. 25: 31-46. Our Lord and Saviour, when he comes with power, will institute this form of his kingdom in our renovated world. 3: 13; Acts 3: 19-21; Dan. 7: 27, with 21, 22 vs.; Luke 1: 32, 33; Rev. 11: 15. In the last passage here referred to, the apostle John foretells that our world is to be the place where the kingdom of our Lord, the Christ of God, is to be established, and his reign in it is expressly declared, as here, to be everlasting. Paul also agrees with Peter herein, for he, after declaring the greatness of the inheritance of God's true children who are to be glorified with Christ, and the littleness and insignificance of their sufferings when compared with that future glory, expressly declares that our renovated world is to be the place where Christ and they who are his, are to be glorified together. Rom. 8: 17-23. Paul also, in this passage, unmistakably indicates the epoch or time, viz., when we obtain "the redemption of our body," which all admit will not be till Christ's second coming. The time then, or great epoch, in which this form of Christ's kingdom shall be established, viz., at his second coming; the place, our renovated world; the duration of his reign here from that epoch, for ever and ever; and the subjects of it, the truly holy, are, in our judgment, scriptural

doctrines and therefore true, and of a holy tendency. And our apostle uses them as the great motive to holiness in this epistle.

The passage, 1 Cor. 15 : 23-28, is difficult of interpretation, (2 Pet. 3 : 16,) but not impossible to be understood. There is an order observed in the resurrection : *First*, Christ rose as the first fruits, and many of the saints soon after, Matt. 27 : 52, 53. *Next*, Christ's people are to be raised at his coming. *Then the last band*, τὸ τέλος, of the dead, *those who are not Christ's*, or the unholy and reprobate, are to be raised, Rev. 20 : 11-15. *THEN*, when all his enemies are become his footstool, when both the holy and unholy have immortal bodies, or bodies indestructible, when death is thus annihilated, *Christ will deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father*. What kingdom? The one he is to institute in the renovated earth at his appearing? Impossible, as God is true; for this is expressly declared by Christ's legates to be *EVERLASTING*. If then his peculiar kingdom as our Mediator is to be everlasting, the kingdom which he is to resign to the Father is his association with him in the government of the universe. *That* kingdom will be given up when all his enemies are under his feet, and death vanquished; not that everlasting one into which the holy shall enter. This interpretation, in substance, is given by David N. Lord.

But some object to Christ's personal reign on earth hereafter, and say, that his reign will be spiritual only. Christ now reigns in heaven; but is he personally absent from heaven because his Spirit dwells in angelic minds and in the spirits of the just made perfect? When he comes again the Spirit shall be poured out upon all flesh, Satanic influences cease, (Joel 2 : 28-31; Rev. 20 : 1-3,) and our world then will be "in principle as pure as this is gross and selfish." And can any Christian brother object to be on our renovated earth with Christ, and like him in body and soul; or to share in the employments and enjoyments of those whose intelligence, holiness and bliss will be as conspicuous as the sun?

¹²Wherefore I always intend to remind you of these things, though ye know them, and are established in the present truth. ¹³I think it right, moreover, as long as I am in this tent, to awaken you by admonition; ¹⁴knowing that speedily my tent is to be laid aside, even as our Lord Jesus Christ made it clear to me. ¹⁵I will also hasten that, after my departure, ye may ever have it in your power to recall these things. ¹⁶For we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, not after we had followed cunningly devised fables, but after we had been eye witnesses of his Majesty: ¹⁷for he received from God the Father honor and glory, when a voice of this sort relating to him, came beneath the greatly befitting glory, This is my Son, my beloved, in whom I delighted. ¹⁸And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount; ¹⁹and hence we have firmer (or, surer) the Prophetic Word; to which ye do well in giving heed, as to a lamp shining in a gloomy place, until daylight break through, and the light-bringer arise [and shed his beams] in your hearts: ²⁰knowing this first, that no scriptural prophecy comes from [the prophet's] own explanation; ²¹for prophecy never came by man's will, but God's holy men spake as moved by the holy Spirit.

In this section the apostle shows the propriety of his zeal in previously enforcing the exhortation respecting advancement in holiness as necessary to the demonstration of the honesty of our confession of Christ, the assurance of our calling and election by God, and as making us meet to be admitted into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour.

V. 12. *Wherefore I always intend to remind you of these things, though ye know them and are established in the present truth.* *Μελλήσω ἀεὶ*=I always intend, it shall ever, or while I live, be my purpose or practical aim. It is the same in signification therefore as *σπουδάσω*, I will hasten, or jealously endeavor, 15 v. The MSS. A. B. C. have this reading, but G. K. have *ὁὐκ ἀμελήσω*, I will not be negligent, or careless. Griesbach edits the latter, Lachmann and Tischendorf, the former. The sense, either way, is exactly the same. The *wherefore*, indicates that Peter refers to the whole preceding context, especially as taken in connection with the phrase, *these things*. If you indeed lean on the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and recollect how

Jesus our Lord has endowed the apostles with the sanctifying and extraordinary gifts of his Spirit, in order to make you like God in moral qualities, you will add to your faith boldness, etc. Thus only can you prove to others, or be sure yourselves, that your acknowledgment of Christ is genuine and your regeneration and election certain; and thus only can you be admitted into our Lord's everlasting kingdom. *Wherefore I intend*, etc.

Though ye know, etc.: That is, the utility of such admonitions is not nullified by the fact that you are well acquainted with such truths, because knowledge and obedience walk too often at a great distance from each other. Hence admonition is perpetually necessary. *Established*, firmly fixed, *in the present truth*, is to be fully convinced of its importance: *τη παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ*. The present truth means the truth I am now inculcating, and which is therefore present to your minds; or, the truth which needs now especially to be enforced. So Benson, McKnight, Scott, Doddridge. Calvin: presentem veritatem nominat, in ejus possessionem certa fide jam ingressi erant. Robinson, "the truth which is with you, which ye have received." But we think the former explanation more natural; because they could not be established in any truth, unless their understanding and faith had received it as indubitable and important; and what Peter says is, that they had so received the truth he is here inculcating; but still admonition was not, on that account, useless.

V. 13, 14. *I*, as an apostle of Jesus Christ, *think it right*, or perfectly consistent with my duty as an apostle. *As long as I am in this tent*; as long as my soul sojourns in its present frail abode, or while I live in my present body. Compare 2 Cor. 5: 1. Thus says Bengel, there is intimated the immortality of the soul, and its brief stay in the mortal body, with the easy manner in which it departs in faith. *To awaken you* *διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς*, to rouse you thoroughly from sleep, (Mark 7: 38, 39,) and hence to stimulate or excite the mind by weighty motives.

| V. 14. *Knowing that speedy is the laying aside of my tent*,

literally; which in our idiom is, knowing that speedily my tent is to be laid aside. The participle expresses a reason. I ever intend to remind you of these things, however well known and believed, because I am sure that the time of my death is swiftly approaching. There is no need of supposing that Peter, at the time of writing this epistle, or just before, had received a revelation concerning the nearness of his departure from the world; for our Lord manifested or made that clear to him by telling him that he would die when old and by crucifixion. John 21: 18, 19.

V. 15. *I will also hasten that, after my departure, ye may ever have it in your power to recall these things.* To hasten is to be diligent and in earnest. He speaks of his death as an *exodus*, that is, a decease, or departure, going out from the world; as a journey by no means to be dreaded. See how grace strengthens that Peter who once trembled before a maid, and how it enables him to "strengthen his brethren." The apostles speak not of "the worms," "the narrow house," as Job with less light did, and as many believers still do; but they call a believer's death a sleep, a departure, or a going home. Why should we persist in painting with frightful colors that which all sentient creatures sufficiently fear? Should not the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ properly tame and regulate the instinctive dread of dying? See Heb. 2: 14, 15. *That ye may ever have it in your power*, or be able, that is by consulting this epistle which I am now writing, as well as the former one. *To recall these things*, literally, to make a remembrance, or collection, of these things. So, in common English, to make a prayer is the same as to pray.

There is a beautiful gradation in 12-15 vs., thus exhibited by Benson: "Truths, though known and firmly believed, in order to have their proper influence, should often be called to remembrance; that therefore he would put them in remembrance of these things; that he would not do it once, but always; and that not only during his life, but likewise after his decease, *i. e.*,

by leaving these two epistles behind him, as their constant monitors."

Peter's haste, or eager desire and effort, to finish this epistle before his martyrdom, shows that the apostle considered *written documents* far preferable to oral tradition, as a means of transmitting important truths to posterity; and better even to those then living who should survive him; and, accordingly, that he had not that dread of the indiscriminate circulation and perusal of the Scriptures in the mother tongue of the people which his so-called successors have evinced.

V. 16. *For we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*, etc. Peter now proceeds to declare the certainty of the second coming of our Lord, in order to admit the holy into his everlasting kingdom. This interpretation is alone consistent with the preceding context. I will hasten that, after my departure, ye may ever have it in your power to recall *these things*, namely, the necessity of progress in holiness to show the reality of your profession, the subjective assurance of your effectual calling and consequent election; to give you the cheering anticipation that you shall not ultimately fail of success, but that thus an entrance shall be richly supplied for you into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, 5-11 vs.; I am very earnest in constantly reminding you of these things, *for* the powerful coming of Christ to reward his saints, by bringing them into his kingdom, is no cunningly devised fable, but a fact unexceptionably attested.

Power and coming, by hendiadys, for powerful coming, or coming with power; "as life and godliness" for a godly life, and "glory and excellency" for excellent glory, 1: 3. *We made known*, etc., *i. e.*, we, the apostles, he speaks of himself together with James and John, who only beheld the transfiguration of the Lord. The Apostle Paul, as a preacher of this coming, need not be excluded; for, although he was not an eye-witness of the transfiguration, yet, on his way to Damascus, he beheld Christ in his

Majesty, our Lord appearing to him, and sending forth, at midday, a light exceeding the brightness of the sun, Acts 26 : 13. He need not be excluded, for another reason, viz., because Paul, and his helpers, preached the gospel of the kingdom in Asia Minor, and our apostle alludes thereto, 1 Pet. 1 : 12. Peter himself also made known the powerful coming of Christ to reward the saints in his first epistle, 1 : 5, 7, 13 ; 4 : 13 ; 5 : 4. The objections to the authenticity of this epistle, drawn from this verse by Neander and others, are refuted in the Introduction.

The main action of the apostles is expressed by the clause, "We made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ;" the circumstances accompanying the action by participial clauses: literally, 'Not having followed cunningly devised fables, but having been eye-witnesses of his majesty;' which, in our idiom, is better expressed by, 'Not after we had followed,' etc. *Εξακολουθήσαντες*: the verb means to follow out and out as a guide: as in 2 : 2, 15, and *LXX.* : Isa. 56 : 11 ; Amos 4 : 2. 'We apostles made known to you the powerful coming of Christ, to bring you into his kingdom, not after we had contrived it skilfully as fables are composed by ingenious men, as false teachers assert, but, after we had been eye-witnesses of His Majesty,' or, 'We have not imitated the Rabbins, False Teachers, or heathen mythologists, in contriving and publishing fables, since our Lord's powerful coming is a fact well attested.'

Eye-witnesses of His Majesty; *ἐπόπται* = lookers on, beholders, eye-witnesses; compare *ἐποπτεύω*, 1 Pet. 2 : 12 ; 3 : 2. Majesty, *μεγαλειότης*, greatness by way of eminence, as in Luke 9 : 43 ; a word highly appropriate to the Great King, God-Man, Luke 1 : 31-33. *Μεγαλωσύνη*, majesty, is applied to God the Father, Heb. 1 : 3. "He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high;" where "the Majesty," or the Greatness, is the abstract for the concrete, the Greatness for God, who alone is Great ; or for the Father as the King of the Universe, at whose side Christ now sits. In like manner, must "His Majesty" be understood here :

‘We made known to you the powerful coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, not after we had followed cunningly devised fables, but after we had, with our own eyes, beheld our Great King in glory.’ Peter alludes to the wonderful change, or transformation of Christ’s bodily appearance on the mount, when his face shone as the sun, and his raiment became white as the light, or like dazzling snow. (Matt. 17; Luke 9; Mark 9.) Then some rays of his indwelling Godhead burst forth through his human frame; then “he manifested forth his glory” as God in flesh; then the apostles beheld the King, who is coming to introduce all the holy into his everlasting kingdom.

Calvin, in his exposition of this verse, says that Peter is showing the truth and certainty of the gospel; referring “power” to Christ’s miracles, and “coming” to his first appearance among men. And, on Matt. 16: 28, he explains the coming of Christ in his kingdom of his first coming, connected with his resurrection and glory in heaven; and that this coming was evinced by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and the rapid propagation of the gospel thence ensuing. And herein he is followed by most interpreters. It is strange, that a man so acute and profound as Calvin was, could give such an interpretation. He is unquestionably mistaken; for (1) Peter is here speaking of the certainty of the second coming of our Lord to reward the holy; of his coming as King, to admit such into his everlasting kingdom, as the preceding context demonstrates, (2.) The noun *παρουσία*, when applied to our Saviour, always means his second personal arrival, or coming to our world. It never, in the New Testament, is used to denote his first coming. See Matt. 24: 3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Cor. 15: 23; 1 Thess. 2: 9; 3: 13; 4: 15; 5: 23; 2 Thess. 2: 1, 8; Jas. 5: 7, 8; 2 Pet. 1: 16; 3: 4; 1 Jno. 2: 28. (3.) Neither does this word ever denote a providential coming of Christ, as some explain it, in Matt. 24. Christ, seated at the Father’s right hand, sent the Roman armies to destroy Jerusalem; this, however is not denoted by “his coming:” he will not come till

the consummation of the age, Matt. 24: 3. "For, as the light-
 ning comes out of the east and shines unto the west, so shall be
 the coming of the Son of Man." Matt. 24: 27. (In a simile,
 the things compared are always to be taken literally: *e. g.* The
 Prophetic Word is compared to a lamp or candle shining in
 a dismal place, 1: 19, and both are to be literally taken. Let
 this be denied, and then it will be impossible for the wit of man
 to discover *what things* are compared, or in what the likeness
 consists: and so in other instances.) (4.) Neither is *parousia*,
 or coming, ever used in the New Testament to signify the ope-
 rations of the Holy Ghost in the propagation of the gospel. (5.)
 Besides, the coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom, (Matt. 16:
 28,) has no reference whatever to the present form of it, as is evi-
 dent from the context. "For the Son of Man shall come in the
 glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall pay off each
 one according to his doing. Verily, I say unto you, there are
 some standing here which shall in no wise taste death, until they
 see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." Matt. 16: 27, 28.
 And six days after, Christ was transfigured, and Peter, James,
 and John were eye-witnesses of his Majesty. Matt. 27. Now,
 surely, our Lord did not appear with his angels, nor reward
 every one according to his deeds, at the institution of the Chris-
 tian church by the apostles; but these things are only to occur
 at his second coming. Calvin's interpretation, then, is untenable.

Sherlock,* Benson, McKnight, and Barnes, understand the
 apostle as referring to Christ's second coming.

If it be asked, what connection has the transfiguration of our
 Lord with his second coming in power and glory? we reply, that
 it was a specimen of it; a miniature, or picture, so to speak; or
 an outward representation to the three apostles of the manner in
 which he shall come in his kingdom, then to establish it on the
 renovated earth. *Calvin* on Matt. 16: 28. *Quia secum adhue*

* "Discourses on the Use and Intent of Prophecy."

disceptare poterant discipuli quando futurus esset ille dies. Dominus eos proprio fiducia erigit, quod scilicet futuræ suæ gloriæ specimen brevi daturus sit. *Bengel*: Transformatio in monte specimen est revelationis gloriæ in die novissimo: et hanc revelationem spectat omne testimonium apostolorum. Acts 10: 42.

The witnesses of the transfiguration were James, Peter, and John; also Elijah and Moses from heaven. Now Elijah in body was changed from mortal to immortal in an instant, perfectly sanctified in spirit, and so translated. Moses also appeared in glory, Luke 9: 31; most likely, in a body prepared for the occasion. It is said indeed, that the Lord buried him, (Deut. 34: 6,) but it is no where said that He raised him from the dead. And hence, his body is to be made incorruptible when Christ comes. But our Lord Jesus Christ towered above all in His Majesty, as the Great King, the Son of the Highest, and the Son of David. If, then, the transfiguration be a specimen of the manner in which Christ is to come in his kingdom, it shows that the saints are to be raised from the dead, like Moses; the living saints changed from mortal to immortal, like Elijah; and men in the natural body, like Peter, James and John, are to belong to his everlasting kingdom.

V. 17. *For he received from God, the Father, honor and glory, when a voice of this sort relating to him came beneath the greatly befitting glory: This is my Son, my Beloved, in whom I delighted.* Honor and glory = most distinguished honor; as in Pet. 1: 7; Rom. 2: 9, the repetition of synonymous nouns denotes intensity. We did not follow skilfully contrived fables when we made known to you the powerful coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; we did not assure you of the certainty of that without the very best evidence for it; for God the Father, at the transfiguration, acknowledged our Lord Jesus Christ as his beloved Son, 'the Lord of the whole earth.' *When a voice of this sort relating to him was brought (i. e., to our ears) under the greatly befitting glory: this is the strictly literal version. A*

voice is used by metonymy for the declaration or sentence uttered by it. A voice *of this sort*, such a declaration as immediately follows, thou art My Son, etc. Christ certainly heard that voice, but the design of the apostle is to show that this voice came to their ears, as he says also in the next verse. This voice *had reference to Christ alone*, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$: this pronoun is employed to designate Him alone as the person honored by the Father; it limits, or restricts, the general expression, as the dative is used in 1 Pet. 4: 6; Eph. 4: 18. *Was borne, or brought beneath the greatly befitting glory*: $\varphi\omega\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\nu\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\varsigma \delta\pi\alpha\delta \tau\eta\varsigma$ This means, 'Came down from the greatly befitting glory,' or 'was heard by us beneath it.' The *greatly befitting* glory shows that Peter did not deem Christ too much honored by such an attestation from God the Father; on the contrary, it was highly becoming to His Majesty.

Glory, here, means brightness, as in 1 Cor. 15: 41; Acts 22: 11; Luke 9: 31, 32. Peter alludes to "the bright cloud that overshadowed them, and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said," etc. Matt. 17: 5; Mark 9: 7; Luke 9: 34, 35. The pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, which attended Israel in the wilderness, which rested on the ark in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple, was the visible sign of Jehovah's presence, and is called the glory of Jehovah. See Ex. 24: 15-17; 49: 34-38; 2 Chron. 5: 13, 14. The bright cloud at the transfiguration was the visible sign of the presence of God the Father, for His voice it was that declared Jesus Christ to be his beloved Son. How precisely this voice was uttered, is not revealed, and is of no practical importance to those who consider the three apostles as competent and credible witnesses of the fact.

This one is my Son, my Beloved, etc., $\delta \upsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon \delta \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon \alpha\delta\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \epsilon\delta\delta\acute{o}\chi\eta\sigma\alpha$, according to the text adopted by Tischendorf. Or, *this one is my beloved Son*, according to the ordinary reading. There is no difference in the sense; only the former reading is more emphatic than the other. *This one*

refers to our Lord Jesus Christ, as to come in power, 16 v. It designates him, therefore, as one of woman born, and yet God's Son, Gal. 4: 4. This is *My Son*, a partaker of my nature or essence. The Son of David as to his human nature, but as to his holy divine nature, the Son of God, as Paul says, Rom. 1: 3 4. (See Hodge in loc.) The Son of David in time, the Son of God from eternity, or the only begotten of the Father, John 1: 14. In Heb. 1: 1-3, Christ, as God in flesh, is called God's Son. And so he is here: *This one is My Son*; this human being now transfigured before you, is also very God.

My Beloved: "The Father loveth the Son," *i. e.*, he loves him in a way and in a degree as he loves none else, and which none but the Father and the Son, from the very nature of the thing, can understand: the Holy Spirit, of course, excepted. John 5: 20; and 3: 35. The Father loves the Son more than the world, (John 3: 16,) more than angels, because He loves the Son as *his equal*, or companion. Zech. 13: 7; Phil. 2: 6. *In whom I delighted*, or towards whom my love has been from eternity directed: εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ ἐδδόκῃσα, the aorist referring to the indefinite past eternity, so to speak. Compare Prov. 8: 23, 30. Or, if the aorist here be considered as equivalent to the perfect tense in classical Greek, then the sense is not essentially changed: "Whom I have ever loved, and in whom I still delight." Or, "Whom I have ever delighted in as my equal, and now delight in as my Christ, sent to redeem men." Comp. Col. 1: 13-15.

The shallow Arian and Socinian interpretation of this declaration of the Father, as meaning simply the Christ, in *their sense* of that phrase, receives no countenance in any part of Scripture; for the Messiah foretold by the prophets, and the Messiah described by the apostles, is one and the same, namely, God-Man, or the Son of God and the Son of David. See Ps. 2: Isa. 9: 6, 7; Luke 1: 31-33. Mic. 5: 2-4; Zech. 14: 9; Rev. 22: 16; and 19: 16. And these passages of David, Isaiah, Micah, and Zechariah, and the words of the angel Gabriel in Luke, set the

Messiah, God-Man, before us as the future King of Israel, and Lord of the whole earth. They declare, in a word, "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" to establish his everlasting kingdom on earth, not in heaven. The second Psalm, for instance, is very clear in this matter; for it speaks of rulers and peoples on earth attempting to oppose the Father and his Christ as to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom: foretells the vanity and madness of their efforts, and declares that the Father will establish his Son as King in Zion, and of the whole world, 1-9 vs.

V. 18. *And this voice which came from heaven*, from the atmosphere, in which the light cloud floated that overshadowed them, and out of which the voice came, as the sacred historians testify. The mountain is deservedly called *holy*, or consecrated, that is, hallowed for the time by the extraordinary manifestations of the presence of God the Father. Compare Ex. 3: 5; Josh. 5: 15. It is not certain that Mount Tabor was the scene of the Transfiguration; it is more probable that it was a mountain near Cæsarea Philippi. (See Robinson and Smith; "Biblical Researches," Vol. 3, pp. 221, 222.)

V. 19. *And hence we have firmer (or, surer,) the Prophetic Word*: καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιώτερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, = καὶ ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἐβεβαιώθη ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος. The expression, "We have more firm the Prophetic Word," is equivalent to the Prophetic Word has been the more confirmed to us. *Kai* here denotes a consequence, (see on 5 v.,) and is the same in signification as *and hence*, or *and so*. *The Prophetic Word* is the same as prophecy of scripture, (20 v.,) the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Accordingly the sense is, we, the apostles who witnessed the Transfiguration of our Lord Jesus Christ, beholding our King in his Majesty, and all who credit our testimony, have the Prophetic Word, which treats so largely of Messiah's second coming in power and glory, confirmed to us more decisively than ever before; inasmuch as our Lord's Transfiguration was designed to give us a specimen of the manner in which he is to come to

establish his everlasting kingdom; and chiefly, because God the Father himself, on that wonderful occasion, declared our Lord to be his beloved Son, that Son who is portrayed in the Prophetic Word as the future legitimate King of Israel, and the rightful Lord of the whole earth. (See on 17 v.)

When the apostle says, "And so we have more firm the Prophetic Word," this does not imply that there was any want of truthfulness in the Prophetic Word, relative to this subject: it was *firm* before the Transfiguration, but *firmer* by it, and after it. The Prophetic Word, treating of the powerful coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, received additional proof and confirmation by his transfiguration; nay more, the highest possible confirmation, by the direct and immediate testimony of him who cannot lie.

Our translators, Pott, Bloomfield, and others, have mistaken the meaning of our apostle's words; and their version, we have also a more sure word of prophecy, or, we have also a surer Word, the Prophetic, disregards the order of the original. To justify this version of Bloomfield and the English Bible, λόγον should have followed immediately after βασιότєρον, but it does not, and there is no manuscript authority for the transposition.

The interpretation above given is, in our judgment, the true one; and if so, other interpretations based on an inaccurate translation must fall to the ground. For example: 'Surer than the fables of false teachers,' 16 v., 2, 3. (Hug.) 'Surer than the miracle of the Transfiguration!' 'Surer to us Jews,' 'Surer to us Christians,' 'surer' equal to 'sure!' (See Calvin, T. Smith, Doddridge, Barnes, and Sherlock, Use and Intent of Prophecy. Disc. I.) All which interpretations, falsely so called, demonstrate that, when the understanding does not see clearly, the fancy will be sure to work blindly.

To which (Prophetic Word) ye do well in giving heed, as to a lamp shining in a dismal place, until daylight break through, and the light-bringer arise [and shed his beams] in your hearts:

ὧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες: comp. Phil. 4: 14, Gr. "To which ye do well in giving heed," or, "By giving heed to which, ye do well." To give heed is to hold the mind to a thing, to bring all our faculties to bear upon it; in a word, *holy attention* to holy things is denoted, including reverence and faith. See Acts 8: 6, with 12 v., 16, 14; 1 Tim. 1: 4; 4: 13; Heb. 2: 1. And these words of Christ's legate contain a pungent reproof to those who affirm that the study of unfulfilled prophecy is of little importance; as well as those who tacitly guide themselves in biblical study by that assumption. Ye discharge your duty by attending to the Prophetic Word as your guide or directory until, etc.

As to a lamp shining in a gloomy place: λύχνος, a lamp or candle, as in Matt. 5: 15; 6: 22. "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path," Ps. 119: 105. The adjective ἀσχηρός, squalidus, is evidently used here as equivalent to dark and filthy, as a prison, or room of a house; gloomy, dismal and dark. Our world, in which sin and death still prevail, is like such a dungeon; the room in which we now abide is a filthy, dismal place. The great day of Christ has not yet dawned upon it. Phil. 2: 16; 2 Pet. 3: 10-12, with 4 v. Most interpreters suppose, the apostle by this comparison intends to show, that prophecy gives but a dim and glimmering light, like a lamp that guides the footsteps of the traveler in the night; or, that the Prophetic Word is designedly obscure, and was contrived by God in such a manner as to give us but imperfect information concerning Christ's second coming, and other future events. Calvin, however, dissents from this view of the simile; Nec vero lucernæ similitudine utitur, ut tenuem et restrictam lucem significet, etc. And we think his judgment in this particular is correct; for the Prophetic Word, at least the most part of it, is not obscure, but written in language literal and figurative, such as men ordinarily use, the laws of which are well defined and not hard to be understood. Isaiah, for example, can be explained with as much ease as Homer by those who will attend to the

laws and characteristics of language, both grammatical and rhetorical. Besides, Peter does not, as it seems to us, say that we must attend to the Prophetic Word as a man uses a lamp out of doors in the thick darkness, as in Ps. 119: 105; but he likens it to a lamp shining in a dismal place, dreary prison or house. Thus Benson, and 'Theophilus of Antioch. (See the Introduction.) This is indeed a rare use of the word *τόπος*, but not without example. Matt. 28: 6. "See the *place* where the Lord lay;" the room or niche in the sepulchre. Luke 2: 7. "Because there was no *place* for them in the inn," *i. e.*, no room in the caravansary vacant into which they could retire. Acts 4: 31. "The *place* was shaken where they were assembled;" the house or room. Now, however cheerless or filthy a room may be, a lamp gives light to all in the apartment. (Matt. 5: 15.) "Neither do men light a lamp, *λόγρον*, and put it under a bushel, but on a lamp-stand, *and then it gives light to all in the house.*" As a lamp shines in a gloomy room, so the Prophetic Word enlightens us as to the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Ye should therefore give heed to it until, etc.

Until the day dawn, (or, daylight break through,) and the light-bringer arise [and shed his beams] in your hearts: *ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαγέσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.* Day, *ἡμέρα*, is the same as *daylight*, as in 2: 13. The day meant, is "the day of Christ," in which he will appear to admit the holy into his kingdom. At that epoch it will be indeed daylight, for then the righteous shall shine as the sun in the kingdom appointed for them by their Father in Christ. Then there will be a renovated world, in which dwelleth righteousness, 3: 13. Then the will of God will be done *on earth* as it is done in heaven. Then "the meek shall inherit the earth." Then all kings shall fall down before our Saviour, and all nations shall serve him, Ps. 72: 11. 'Give heed to the Prophetic Word until the morning of Christ's day; until the beams which betoken the rising of the Sun of Righteousness are distinctly visible.

And the light-bringer arise in your hearts: this is the literal version. The noun, *light-bringer*, φωσφόρος, means either the morning star, or the sun; but it is better to consider it as signifying the sun, the light-bringer to our world. In Rev. 22: 16, Jesus calls himself "the bright morning star;" but the word star is not used by our apostle; it is not in the original. The Messiah is named "the sun of righteousness" by the prophet Malachi: Comp. Ps. 84: 11. Now, it would be a very incongruous figure indeed to suppose that Peter intended to speak either of a star or of the sun arising in human hearts: it is a pregnant construction, and the sense is, And the sun shall arise, and by arising shed his beams in (or, on) your hearts. The word "heart" in scripture denotes both the intellectual and moral faculties; and as there is nothing here to restrict it to the understanding alone or to the affections exclusively, it is best to understand it of both. Give heed to the Prophetic Word until the great epoch for the establishment of Christ's everlasting kingdom arrives, and our Lord himself, the sun of righteousness, by his coming flashes irresistible conviction on your understanding, and enkindles your affections to the highest degree. Then the saints will rejoice before Jehovah-Christ, their king. See Ps. 98: 4-9; Isa. 25: 8, 9. The natural language of our hearts then will be, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us" [in the eternity to come;] "This is Jehovah; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation."

It is no valid objection to this interpretation that it represents that day as near; for this is the usual scriptural method of treating the subject. Matt. 24: 44; 25: 13; 1 Thess. 4: 15. The day and the hour, the Father has reserved to himself; commissioning no angel, prophet or apostle, nor even our Lord Jesus Christ himself, to make it known. The right posture of our hearts, therefore, is "*to wait for his Son from heaven.*" 1 Thess. 1: 10; 1 Cor. 1: 7; Col. 3: 4; 1 Jno. 3: 2.

V. 20. *Knowing this first that not any prophecy of scripture*

begins to be of (or, from) *own explanation*. This bald literal version corresponds to the original, and may be of use to the mere English reader, in order to an intelligent view of the exposition now to be given. The participle *knowing*, expresses a supposition assumed as true, 3 : 3. ‘By giving heed to the Prophetic Word ye do well, provided ye know, as I take for granted, this fact, that no prophecy, etc.’ *First*, in importance, especially, *Prophecy of Scripture*=prophecy contained in the Old Testament, or *Scriptural Prophecy*: thus true prophecy is denoted as opposed to divination. False prophecy may be found in many books, but the true only in Scripture. *Begins to be*, or, *comes of*, *γίνεται*: “Before Abraham began to be,” etc. John 8 : 58 ; Matt. 8 : 24 ; 2 Pet. 2 : 1. “False prophets began to be among the people,” or, false prophets *arose* among them. Gal. 4 : 4. “God sent forth his Son, *born* of a woman ;” or, who, as to his human nature, began to be of, or took his origin from, a woman. Now Peter denies that Scriptural Prophecy begins to be, or arises *from own explanation*. Any one can discern that this clause means more than what is literally said ; and it may be called a pregnant construction, or elliptical expression, as the reader deems best. Something must be supplied to make it intelligible in our idiom ; but this must be perfectly consistent with the subject and aim of the writer. The main subject is Christ’s second coming ; the aim here, and in the following verse, is to direct them and us how to attend to Scriptural Prophecy, namely, with reverence and faith. We must especially know, by examining the evidence in the case, that Scriptural Prophecy is not of human, but of divine original ; or, that the Old Testament prophecies are not a record of human conjectures and shrewd guesses, not an explanation or unfolding simply of what the prophets thought or willed, but a revelation of God’s mind and will. The ellipsis, then, may be supplied thus : “Provided ye first know this, that no scriptural prophecy comes of *the prophet’s own explanation* ;” *i. e.*, scriptural prophecy is not an explanation of the

prophet's own mind or will: it is not a revelation of his thoughts, but of God's.

But if we *translate the thought* of the apostle, then the best version is as follows: "Provided ye first know this, that no scriptural prophecy is of the prophet's own invention."

Calvin, Mill, Benson, McKnight, T. Smith, Whitby, Doddridge and Robinson, agree that the meaning is as above explained; though they arrive at the same result somewhat differently. That this is the only true interpretation appears, not only from the following words, "for prophecy never came by man's will," but also from the untenableness of the other explanations that have been proposed.

Let us look at these suggestions and see whether they do not lead us to the true interpretation. Grotius suggests an emendation of the text, *ἐπηλυσσεως* for *ἐπιλυσσεως*. He might also have suggested *ἐπιλυσιας*. But the fundamental rule of biblical criticism is to alter nothing by conjecture; and no manuscript examined contains either of the words: nine, according to Tischendorf, has *διαλυσσεως*, and that is the only various reading noticed by him. The text therefore, is unassailable.

Horsely rashly assumes that the design of the apostle in this verse is to give us a rule, or leading principle, whereby we must interpret prophecy. ("Sermons" XV., XVI., XVII., XVIII.) He contends that Peter's meaning is, "that no prophecy of scripture is of self-interpretation; that is, that no single prophecy is its own interpreter, because the scripture prophecies are not detached predictions of separate, independent events, but are united in a regular and entire system, all terminating in one great object—the promulgation of the gospel, and the complete establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. Of this system, every particular prophecy makes a part, and bears a more immediate or a more remote relation to that which is the object of the whole. It is therefore, very unlikely, that the true signification of any particular text of prophecy should be discovered from the bare

attention to the terms of the single prediction, taken by itself, without considering it as a part of that system, to which it unquestionably belongs, and without observing how it may stand connected with earlier and later prophecies, especially with those which might more immediately precede, or more immediately follow it. Again, of the whole of the scripture prophecies, it is true that it cannot be its own interpreter. Its meaning never can be discovered, without a general knowledge of the principal events to which it alludes; for prophecy was not given to enable curious men to pry into futurity, but to enable the serious and considerate to discern in past events the hand of Providence." This, Horsley calls "an infallible rule of interpretation!"

Moreover, he assigns a forced meaning to *επιλοσις*; *affirming without proof*, that "it is the specific name of that sort of exposition which renders the mystic sense of parables, dreams, and prophecies." Again he says: "'Twas undoubtedly within the power of the Almighty to have delivered the whole of prophecy in terms no less clear and explicit than those in which the general promises of revelation are conveyed, or particular deliverances of the Jewish people occasionally announced: but his wisdom reprobated this unreserved prediction of futurity, because it would have enlarged the foresight of man beyond the proportion of his other endowments, and beyond the degree adapted to his present condition. To avoid this mischief, and to attain the useful end of prophecy, which is to afford the highest proof of Providence, it was necessary that *prophecy should be delivered in such guise as to be dark while the event is remote, to clear up as it approaches, and to be rendered perspicuous by the fulfilment.*" If this be not comparing prophecy to "a lamp put under a bushel," what can it mean? Does a lamp *shining* in a gloomy room make it *dark*?

And who supposes that scriptural prophecies are detached predictions? Who asserts the uselessness of historical study? Who denies the profit arising from comparing predictions with one another, or endeavoring to gain a synoptical view of pro-

phcey as a whole? But *how is it possible for these predictions to be united in one grand system*, or unfold the one great plan and design of the Almighty, *if the particular portions, each of which must help to unfold this scheme, are so written as not to be perspicuous until after the event foretold has come to pass?* Can facts or events make those words plain which are in themselves dark? According to this view, scriptural prophecy would cease to be a revelation from God, since it would and could, in fact, disclose—nothing. If the chapters that make up Calvin's "Institutes of the Christian Religion," were, separately considered, expressed in dark and enigmatical language, how could the whole work be a clear and able system of divinity? How could a knowledge of the principal events of Calvin's life alone make his language in the Institutes perspicuous? If every chapter of Isaiah, in itself considered, is dark, how can his whole book be called the vision, or revelation, which was imparted to him? What then can it reveal, or how can it ever be understood? All the splash and dash, then, of apparent argument here shown by Horsley in defending his explanation of the apostle, ends in what may be called critical foam, or learned nonsense.

Beza says: "The prophets must indeed be read, but so that the gift of interpretation should be sought from God, in order that the author and interpreter of the prophetic scriptures may be the same." But here those influences of the Holy Ghost which sanctify the human heart, and those which qualify men to be prophets, or interpreters of God's mind and will, are confounded. Many prophets will be condemned by Christ when he comes with power, because unholy and sinners. Matt. 7: 21-23. To be supernaturally enlightened and to be supernaturally sanctified then are not the same, and we must discern things that differ. With respect to prophecy, or holy scripture in general, it is certainly true that "study without prayer is Atheism, and prayer without study, presumption;" yet prayerful study of the prophetic scriptures makes no one a prophet: if it does, then

prophecy comes by the will of man, and so all prayerful commentators on the prophets would be inspired ; which the history of interpretation in Beza's own day might have taught him to be baseless, and the same history from that time until now must demonstrate to us. The Holy Ghost cannot be the author of conflicting and contradictory interpretations. Besides, Peter's scope is not to propose a rule of interpretation, as Horsley supposed ; neither is it to show from whom the gift of interpreting prophecy is to be obtained ; but to declare that scriptural prophecy is not of human, but of divine original, (20, 21 vs.) and that therefore we should read, hear and study it with attention, reverence and faith.

The Rhemish Annotators thus briefly and crabbedly remark : "The scriptures cannot be rightly expounded of every private spirit or fantasy of the vulgar reader ; but by the same spirit wherewith they were written, which is resident in the church." But Peter is speaking, not of the scriptures in general, but of *prophecy* of scripture. Next, the apostle's aim is not to show from whom the gift of interpreting prophecy is to be derived, as just proved. Lastly, it is assumed, without one grain of proof, that the Holy Spirit is resident in the church ; which is a great deal to take for granted. For to assume that the church means the Roman clergy, to the exclusion of the vulgar laic reader, is limiting and confining the Holy Spirit's influences to pipes and conduits of their own manufacture. But whether this interpreting spirit resides in the Pope alone, or in a general council of prelates alone, or in both combined, is a question which the Roman church, with its boasted infallibility, has not been enabled to decide. Until this is done, we may justly declare such words as the above to be, not an interpretation of Peter, but a distinguished and characteristic specimen of Roman arrogance.

What our translators meant by "any private interpretation," passes our comprehension, and it is probable that the phrase is

an enigma to most readers. A desire to be literal has occasioned a verbal version that is unintelligible as well as inaccurate; thus involving the present context in darkness to the mere English reader.

V. 21. *For Prophecy never came by man's will: οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἤνέχθη προφητεία ποτε, ἀλλὰ—* For this position of ποτε, are B. C. K. 69, 137, and many other manuscripts. (Tischendorf Griesbach and Lachmann place it immediately after ἤνέχθη.) Literally, *For prophecy was not once* (or, not formerly,) *brought to man's will*; or it never came at the bidding of his will; it was never bestowed because he wished or prayed for it, or struggled by determined efforts to obtain it.

*But God's holy men spake as moved by the Holy Ghost. God's holy men, ἅγιοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι: A. and Vulgate, Sancti Dei homines: Griesbach and Lachmann, Ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, Men (sent) from God, B. 66** 68, 69, 137, Tischendorf. But as holy here means, not sanctified, but consecrated, set apart by God for their office as his spokesmen, both readings convey precisely the same thought. To be commissioned by God as a prophet, and to be consecrated by him to that office, are identical in signification. These consecrated men of God spake: this includes their writings; they taught, orally and by the pen. 1 Pet. 4: 11. 2 Pet. 3: 16; Jas. 5: 10; Acts 2: 31, and 3: 24. Moved by the Holy Spirit; literally, borne on, (carried or moved) under the Holy Ghost. The passive participle is employed to denote that the prophets were recipients of a gift bestowed. Under, ὑπο, =under the controlling influence of, or by the agency of, the Holy Ghost. Accordingly the sense is: Scriptural prophecy is not an explanation of the prophet's own mind or will; it did not originate in this way; for prophecy never came at the bidding of man's will, but men were set apart by God for this office, who taught by the voice and pen under the controlling influence of the Holy Spirit, or by his suggestion and agency. See Doddridge in loc, and comp. Heb. 1: 1; Rom. 1: 2.*

CHAPTER II.

¹False prophets moreover arose among the people, as also false teachers shall be among you, who shall craftily bring in destructive heresies, and especially by denying that their Redeemer is Sovereign (or Lord,) bringing on themselves swift destruction: ²and many shall follow their lascivious doings, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of (or reviled:) ³and in consequence of covetousness, with feigned words shall they buy and sell you; against whom the judgment long since [threatened] comes not lingeringly, and their destruction slumbers not.

The apostle, in this chapter, like Paul in 2 Thess. 2, predicts, *not* that the gospel is everywhere to be successful in the world before Christ's coming, according to the prevalent opinion of the church now; on the contrary, he foretells that false teachers shall arise to pervert the gospel, and lead many from the way of truth to fables; and in the next chapter, he predicts that our Lord's second coming will be considered a fit subject for irreverent jesting or satirical contempt. In other words, our apostle shows that the church of Christ, under this dispensation, is to be infested with false teachers and scoffers until Christ himself comes in power to make new heavens and earth in which dwelleth righteousness. Evident it is, therefore, that Peter held Christ's second coming to our world to be before the millennium, and not after it; before it, for the very purpose of introducing and perpetuating his personal reign here.

Calvin thus comments on the first verse: "Since, at the rise of false teachers who corrupt or lacerate the doctrine of faith, the consciences of the weak are on this account wont to be shaken in a powerful and dangerous manner; it was necessary for the apostle, as his design was to exhort the faithful to constancy, to take such a stumbling block out of the way. He also comforts and strengthens those to whom he writes by this argument, viz.,

that God has always trained his church by this sort of trial, that so their minds might not be smitten with amazement as if it were a strange thing. Not otherwise, says Peter, shall the condition of the church be under the gospel than it was formerly under the law: false prophets disturbed the ancient church; the same must also be looked for by us. It became the apostle distinctly to give this testimony, because many imagined a tranquil state of the church under Christ's reign; for since the prophets promise at his advent firm peace, the sum of heavenly wisdom, and a complete restoration of all things, they did not think that the church would any longer be exposed to any contests. Let us remember, therefore, that the Spirit of God has once for all declared this, that the church will never be free from this intestine evil; and let us recollect this analogy, that the trial of faith is common to us with the ancient saints, since there is the same reason for both, namely, that in this way it may appear whether we truly love God, as it is written, Deut. 13: 3." Thus clearly does the great reformer and expositor show that Peter exhibits the state of the church under the gospel as a time of perpetual trial and conflict, not of triumph, and that it will never be otherwise while this dispensation of Christ's grace continues.

V. 1. *False prophets, moreover, arose among the people; i. e.,* they who pretended to be under the inspiring influence of the Holy Spirit, but were not; they who made known their own mind and thoughts, not God's. See Num. 16: 28; Jer. 23: 16-26. *The people*, that is, Israel, among whom were both true and false prophets, 1: 19-21. *As also false teachers shall be among you*, or those who will promulgate error among professed Christians, whether pretending to inspiration or not. "Notice," says Calvin, "that not one period simply is intended by Peter, when he says, 'There shall be false teachers,' but all ages are rather comprehended. For here he compares Christians with the ancient people." *Who shall craftily bring in, i. e., into the church, or among you, professed disciples:* οἱ πονηροὶ μαρτυροῦσιν. The verb

means either to lead in by the side of another, bring forward, introduce; or to bring in something beside that which is apparent, introduce secretly or cunningly. Peter uses it in the latter signification. Compare Gal. 2: 4; Jude, 4 v. "To lead in by stealth, to smuggle in," as Robinson happily explains it. *Heresies of destruction*, αἰρέσεις ἀπολείας equivalent to destructive heresies, or deadly heresies. Heresy strictly means choice, and hence it is generally employed to denote what we call school, sect, or party. Acts 5: 17; 15: 5; 26: 5; 28: 22. But no school of philosophy, no sect, party, or denomination of Christians, can be established except it be built on some distinguishing opinion or opinions. Accordingly in this place the word designates both; sects of professed Christians holding opinions destructive to their eternal happiness. False teachers who cunningly introduce into the church fatal errors and draw away disciples after them, (Acts 20: 29, 30,) are wolves, not sparing the flock. And it is indisputable that our apostle here uses the word "heresies" to designate both *false doctrinal views, subversive of the gospel, and the sects thus originated*, by which the unity of the visible church has been destroyed, agreeably to his prediction. For he defines them as "*heresies of destruction*," and this word "destruction" denotes the second death, future punishment, the destruction, not of man's being, but of his well-being. See Matt. 7: 13; Acts 8: 20; Rom. 9: 22; Phil. 1: 28; 3: 19; 1 Tim. 6: 9; Heb. 10: 39; Rev. 17: 8, 11; John 17: 12; 2 Thess. 2: 3, here and 3: 16. Comp. Matt. 10: 28. The heresies, (or sects built on error,) meant then, are of the worst sort, such as lead ment o destruction, or the loss of eternal life. "False prophets arose," ἐγένοντο, began to be, arose, or were: ὡς καὶ = "even as," (Rev. 6: 11,) "as also among you there shall be false teachers:" i. e., false prophets appeared among the Israelites in all periods of their history down to Christ's first coming, also false teachers shall be among you Christians until his second coming.

And especially denying that their Redeemer is [their] Sover-

eign, bringing on themselves swift destruction : καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀφουρμενοί, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοὺς ταχὺν ἀπώλειαν. *And, i. e., and in particular, and especially* ; for καί not only connects words and sentences, but also emphatically distinguishes single word or clause, (Liddell and Scott's Lexicon.) And that in divers modes : *e. g.*, θεοὶ καὶ Ζεὺς, "the gods, and above all (especially) Jupiter," θεοὶ καὶ Ποσειδῶν, "the gods, and in particular Neptune," Æsch. Pers. 750. Where a part is subjoined to a whole by way of emphasis, says Robinson, καί may be rendered *and especially, imprimis*, Mark 1 : 5. "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, *and especially* they of Jerusalem." Mark 16 : 7. "Tell his disciples, *and Peter in particular*," Matt. 8 : 33. "They told all, *and especially* the things relating to the demonized." Precisely so here : 'There shall be false teachers among you, men who shall craftily introduce into the church deadly heresies, and in particular (or, especially) denying that their Redeemer is Lord.' Calvin : Cæterum nos admonet Spiritus Dei, ut intenti simus ad cavendum ; atque huc spectat tota descriptio quam mox subjiciet. Quanquam singulas sectas non pinget suis coloribus, sed peculiariter sermonem dirigit in homines profanos qui Dei contemptum inducunt. Generalis quidem est sententia, Cavendum esse a falsis doctoribus ; sed interea speciem unam elegit, unde plus instabat periculi. Quod ex Judæ verbis melius patet, qui idem prorsus argumentum tractat. Here Calvin, in substance, says that the Spirit of God admonishes us to beware of false teachers, that this is the general thought ; that the apostle, however, does not portray each and every heretical sect in their appropriate colors, but selects one species or class of the false teachers, from whose teachings and doings more danger was imminent. It is clear then, that he considered καί as introducing a proposition which describes a particular class of heresies, or as a part of that of which destructive heresies is the whole.

Denying, that is, by denying, the participle expressing the

manner in which they bring on themselves swift destruction. "Bringing on themselves swift destruction;" how? "By denying that their Redeemer is Lord." It is common in Greek for words of affirming and denying, or which have that signification, to take the accusative with the infinitive, expressed or implied: so here, literally: *Denying that he who redeemed them (is) Sovereign*. Words expressive of a mental act or affection are commonly construed in the same way, as in the thirteenth verse: "Thinking that riot in daylight (is) Pleasure." *Their Redeemer*, that is, acknowledged as such: comp. 2: 20. They confess him as Redeemer, but deny him as *δεδωκεν*. Now this word means *Master*, as opposed to slaves, head of a family; its ruler or governor. 1 Tim. 6: 1, 2; Tit. 2: 9; 1 Pet. 2: 8. It is also applied to God as *the Sovereign*, ruler and master of men; their Lord whom they are bound to obey by right of creation; as in Acts 4: 22, "Sovereign, thou who art the Maker of heaven and earth and sea, and all that are in them," etc. (Peter probably led in this prayer.) Luke 2: 29, "Sovereign, (or Master, Lord,) now dismiss thy servant in peace." etc. Rev. 6: 10, "How long, Sovereign, holy and true," etc.

It is also applied to our Lord Jesus Christ, or to him as both Redeemer and Lord; as here, where it is said that the false teachers shall admit the one, but deny, (verbally or practically, or in both methods,) the other. 2 Tim. 2: 21, is a parallel passage: "Whoever, then, shall purify himself from these," such heretics as Hymenæus and Philetus, "he shall be a vessel for honor, consecrated, useful to his *Sovereign*," etc.: that is, his Lord and Master Christ, as the preceding context demonstrates. Jude, 4 v. "Ungodly, inasmuch as they have perverted the grace of our God unto lasciviousness, and deny Jesus Christ our only Sovereign and Lord."

The ancient Gnostics denied that Jesus Christ was Sovereign or Lord; they made him but an *Æon*, an emanation from God's fullness, a sort of angel, only seemingly incarnate. In a word,

they denied his præexistence as the Eternal Logos cœqual with the Father, and his incarnation. In their view he was not Theanthropos, or God in flesh. 1 Jno. 4: 1-3. The Arians denied his Godhead strictly understood, and made him to be the first-created and highest of intelligent beings in human form; which was a modified revival of the Gnostic heresy. The Socinians, with the so-called Unitarians of a later period, admit him to be a sinless man, the greatest of God's prophets, and Saviour; but they deny his atonement in the scriptural sense, and are decided opponents of his supreme Godhead. Most modern Unitarians also deny the everlasting duration of the punishment of the wicked; assimilating herein with the Universalists, who contend that all, without exception, are saved at death; or with the Restorationists who believe, that all at last will be saved, the more abandoned, however, being punished in a sort of purgatory for an undefined period hereafter. The prediction in this verse then, inclusive of the denial by false teachers of the future punishment of the wicked by Jesus Christ, has been and is abundantly fulfilled.

The Redeemer is practically denied to be Lord and Master, when his professed disciples are heedless in obeying him; when they set aside his authority as the Law-giver of the church, and act as they please, and not as the Lord Jesus commands; or when they act on the supposition that there is grace in Christ, but not justice, and that he will not, as judge, consign any to everlasting punishment, contrary to clear and emphatic warnings from Christ himself. Matt. 10: 28; 25: 46; Rev. 2: 23.

Bringing on themselves swift destruction. This shows that to deny our Redeemer to be Lord is a *destructive* heresy. Such professors may flatter themselves that their error is harmless, a mistake that the merciful Saviour will readily forgive. But the Spirit of Christ has in the clearest manner taught that our Redeemer is Sovereign, God-Man, and Judge; that eternal life awaits the believing and holy, and everlasting punishment the

unbelieving and wicked. If these things be not indubitable, the holy scriptures reveal nothing that can be relied on. And they who are blind, willingly shutting their eyes against the light, (9 v.,) *bring on themselves* destruction; or are the authors of their everlasting misery. It cannot be an innocent or harmless thing to entertain false views of Jesus Christ for those who have in their hands the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The apostles unquestionably represent him as Theanthropos; as the Creator and conserver of the universe; as the Redeemer of lost men; and hence as their Sovereign, Lord and Master, not only by right of creation, but also by right of redemption; and also as the future judge of all mankind. See John 1: 1-3, with 14 v.; Col. 1: 13-18; 2 Tim. 4: 1; Acts 17: 31; 1 Pet. 2: 9. To deny then, in word or deed, that our Redeemer is Sovereign, is an error that "drowns men in destruction and perdition."

T. Smith considers *ἑαυτοὺς* as equivalent to "one another," as in 1 Pet. 4: 8. Thus understood the sense is: They bring destruction not only on themselves, but also on their disciples and imitators. Peter calls it *swift* destruction, because "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." Compare Jas. 5: 7-9; 2 Pet. 3: 8, 9. The destruction of false teachers would soon be accomplished, as to their souls at death, and as to both soul and body when Christ appears as Judge. Comp. 1: 14. 23: 9, 10. The reference is especially to the latter. Bengel: *celerem*, ob celerem adventum Domini. It will be but a short time before our Lord comes, when compared with the long starless night of eternity in which teachers of known falsehood shall grope and stumble and rage in hell.

V. 2. *And many shall follow their lascivious doings, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.* "They who perverted the grace of our God unto lasciviousness, and denied our only Sovereign and Lord Jesus Christ," (Jude, 4 v.,) were Antinomian-Gnostics. Jude thus records the speedy fulfilment of Peter's prophecy, as well as shows how he understood

it. We err not therefore in saying that Arians, Socinians or Unitarians, and Universalists, in whatever part of the visible church they exist, deny that the Redeemer is Sovereign. And so do they who are orthodox in lip and creed, but heterodox in life. "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven," etc. Matt. 7: 21-23.

The correct reading is *ασεληγεια*, translated in the margin of the English Bible: in favor of it are A. B. C. G. K. and the Vulgate. Literally, their *lasciviousnesses*: either their lascivious doings or teachings, or both. 'Many shall imitate their profligate actions by believing their erroneous doctrines.' The Antinomian Gnostic, in the ante Nicene age of the church, (compare Rev. 2: 14, 15,) were notorious for their lasciviousness, the proofs of which may be found in the histories of Gieseler, Neander, and Schaff. Uncleanness, indeed, is a striking characteristic of all the false teachers that have craftily introduced destructive heresies, from the time of the Gnostics down to "the Latter-Day Saints," or Mormons. And yet such have always pretended to be *saints* by way of eminence, and *scientific theologians* (which the word, Gnostics means,) who alone understood the way of truth! (See also Whitby and Benson.) The Roman church, too, by forbidding her clergy to marry, has certainly countenanced lasciviousness.

By reason of whom, or, on whose account: *δι' οὗ*. *The way of the truth*, literally: the scriptures give a revelation of the true method of salvation; "the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation," as Paul expresseth it, Eph. 1: 13. Here the gospel is especially intended, the grace of God perverted by them to lasciviousness. The profligacy of such false teachers and their followers, assuming the Christian name, caused the heathen to calumniate the true gospel, and gave occasion to the circulation of the most outrageous stories respecting true and false disciples of Christ indiscriminately; the evidences of which abound in the pages of the early Christian apologists, Justin

Martyr, Tertullian, and others. The shameless licentiousness of the Papal clergy, at the time of the Reformation and before, is also well known, on whose account the way of truth has been evil spoken of.

V. 3. *And in consequence of covetousness, etc.*: καὶ ἐν πλεονεξία. *In covetousness, literally: in consequence of or through avarice.* (See on 1: 4.) *With feigned words, πλαστοῦσι λόγοις*, moulded words; words put in the mould of their own invention and shaped to suit their purpose, as the potter makes up the clay to suit his: compare Rom. 9: 20; 1 Tim. 2: 13. The words meant then are feigned or fictitious, *self-contrived*; drawn from their own minds, not from an honest investigation and explanation of the scriptures. Now the *words* of a teacher can mean only his *doctrines*, or religious instructions. 1 Cor. 1: 18. "For *the word* of the cross," the doctrine of the Atonement, "is to them who are perishing, foolishness." Eph. 5: 6. "Let no one deceive you *with vain words*, for because of these things the wrath of God is coming upon the children of disobedience." 2 Tim. 2: 17. "Their *word* will eat (or, spread) as a cancer; of whom are Hymenæus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the Resurrection is already past," etc. Their self-contrived doctrines are like counterfeit bills wherewith, because of covetousness, they trade in human souls.

With feigned words *shall they buy and sell you*: ὑμᾶς ἐμπορεύσονται. So the verb is rendered. Jas. 4: 13. It means to travel about as a merchant, to trade, *i. e.*, buy and sell; and this is always done for the pecuniary advantage accruing. Compare LXX. and Heb.; Gen. 34: 10-21; 42: 34; Ezek. 27: 21. The sense then is: They, because of covetousness, will, with their self-contrived doctrines, get all the money out of you they can; buying and selling you like a bale of goods for their own profit. They shall teach what they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. Tit. 1: 11.

Against whom the judgment long since [threatened] comes not

lingeringly, and their destruction [long since foretold] *slumbers not*: οὐδὲ τὸ κρίμα, either the judgment to whom=*whose judgment*, (Rom. 3:8,) or, *against whom the judgment*; but either way the sense is the same. Judgment, by implication, condemnation, as in Rom. 3:8; 1 Tim. 3:6. That some word like *threatened* or *denounced* must be supplied is clear from Jude, 4 v., "Those long since proscribed to this judgment," *i. e.*, the judgment well known as long ago foretold by the prophets to overtake such ungodly men. See Dent. 32:35; Ps. 5:37; 9-13; This judgment *lingereth not*, οὐκ ἀργεῖ, comes not as an idle man (ἀργος, 1:8,) walks: *i. e.*, their condemnation is rapidly approaching. *And their destruction*, that is the destruction long since denounced against such sinners as their just due: ἐκπαλαί is to be supplied from the preceding clause. This destruction *slumbers not*, οὐ νοφέζει, is not nodding or slumbering: *i. e.*, it is not forgotten. Their punishment is not only swiftly approaching, but there is no danger of its ever being forgotten. Or, 'it is both near and certainly to be executed.' Compare 9 v., 3:7.

To be in a state of slumber is to be in a state of forgetfulness, but God's justice is never asleep. Instead of their punishment never coming, as if justice did not demand the destruction of the incorrigible, it is coming swiftly: instead of there being any doubt about the infliction of the penalty announced and deserved, it is absolutely certain. Against such Antinomian-Universalists Paul denounces the same judgment. Eph. 5:3-7; Col. 3:5, 6. (Compare 1 Pet. 4:17, 18.)

The apostle, having declared in general that false teachers shall infest the Christian church, even as false prophets did the Jewish; and in particular that false teachers shall arise who will deny their Redeemer to be Sovereign, or their Lord as God in flesh: he thus describes them, in modern language as Antitrinitarian Antinomians. For they who deny their Redeemer to be Sovereign and Lord, who walk lasciviously, and because of covetousness trade in human souls, certainly set aside his authority as the

Lord of the church ; they pervert the gospel of God to the vilest purposes. He describes them, at the same time, in such a way as to indicate unmistakably that they would deny the future and everlasting punishment of the wicked ; in modern language, as Universalists. Why, if not to intimate this characteristic tenet of the false teachers, does he say that their sins are the proximate cause of their *destruction*, or *that they bring it on themselves* ? Why does he speak of their *destructive* heresies ? Of their *judgment* as *lingering not*, and their *destruction* as *slumbering not* ? What, moreover, is the apostle's aim in proving that punishment shall certainly be inflicted on such unrighteous men ? All this unquestionably pre-supposes, that the false teachers would deny the reality and certainty of such punishment.

'For if God spared not angels that sinned, but [bound] with chains of darkness hurled them into hell, and delivered them up to be kept for judgment ; ⁵and spared not the Old World, but guarded Noah, one of eight, a preacher of righteousness, when he brought the flood on an ungodly world ; ⁶and when he burned to ashes the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, by the overthrow he condemned them, setting them forth as an example to them who shall live ungodly ; ⁷and yet he rescued righteous Lot, worn out by the lascivious behaviour of the lawless : ⁸for that righteous one while dwelling among them, by seeing and hearing, tormented his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds ; [if these things be so, then] ⁹the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous for the day of judgment to be punished ; ¹⁰but especially those who walk after the flesh in filthy lust, and despise government.

The apostle in this paragraph is showing the absolute certainty of the punishment of false teachers, and their imitators, at the day of judgment ; or when Christ comes as judge of the wicked. And the historical arguments employed in this context are laid on an immovable foundation, *the immutability of God* ; on the clearly revealed truth that he is as unchangeable in his justice as in grace or mercy, or in any other perfection of his nature. "*He cannot deny himself*," (2 Tim. 2 : 13,) that is he cannot act unlike himself, or in a way inconsistent with any perfection of his

Godhead. He is *the same just God now, and will be to all eternity*, as when he severely punished angels that sinned, the antediluvians, or the inhabitants of the plain. He is as unchangeable in his knowledge and power now as then, (9 v;) no sins escape the notice of his omniscient eye, and no sinner can get out of the reach of the hand of the Almighty. It follows therefore, that false teachers and their followers, except they repent, (3: 9,) cannot be passed by unpunished.

The absolute certainty of the deliverance of the pious from a state of trial when our Lord comes, is also shown in this paragraph. God's kindness to the godly will be *the same* at the day of judgment as when he guarded Noah by the shield of his almighty love, and made the ark to swim unharmed on the flood that drowned an ungodly world; it will be the same on that great day to them who love Christ and holiness as it was to Lot—they shall have certain knowledge of the signal punishment of the ungodly, but escape it themselves; for "God in Christ" is as unchangeable in his grace and tender mercy as in his justice.

V. 4. *For if God spared not Angels that sinned*, etc. The argumentative particle *for* depends on the latter part of the third verse. 'Their judgment lingers not, and their destruction slumbers not; for if God spared not,' etc. The protasis begins here, the apodosis, at the ninth verse: 'If God spared not angels, etc., then (*ἀρα* implied before *οἱ ὄντες*) the Lord knows,' etc. Other modes have been suggested with reference to the apodosis, but none seems so accurate as the one here given, in which the most eminent expositors agree.

Peter briefly refers to the fall of the Angels as a well known fact, clearly, though incidentally taught in Holy Scripture. He says nothing of the time when they sinned, the manner in which they manifested their transgression, and other circumstances attending it,—because these things would have had but an indirect bearing on his present argument. He wishes to confine our attention directly to a single point, viz.: Angels that sinned were

punished, and that in a signal manner. This fact, the inseparable connection between sin and punishment, bears directly on his present argument, and demonstrates that those who walk in the way of lewdness and avarice, and deny their professed Redeemer to be Lord and Master will be punished at the day of judgment, when their Sovereign calls them to account for their vile misdeeds.

The expression, "Angels that sinned," implies that others did not, and hence we read of "the elect angels," 1 Tim. 5, 21, "faithful found among the faithless." The same expression also implies that they were originally created in a holy state. No other supposition can stand a moment before the bar of right, reason or Scripture; for "God is Light, and in him is no darkness at all," 1 John 1 : 5 ; *i. e.* God is perfectly holy, and in him there is no sin at all. It is absolutely impossible therefore that any sinful suggestion could have been proposed to angelic minds by the Holy One; in this sense, "God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any one," whether man or angel, Isa. 1, 13-15. The sinful thoughts and deeds of angels, then, must have originated in their own minds. If we attempt to proceed farther in this inquiry, what progress can we make? If men will believe no fact unless they can at the same time understand how and why it is so, they will be forced to put but one article in their creed, as follows: I believe in — Nothing. The revealed fact is, that Angels sinned. If any ask, How can such a fact be believed? we answer, If you receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater; for God cannot lie. 1 John 5 : 9 ; Heb. 6 : 18. If you farther ask, Why did God permit them to sin, or why did he not prevent them from sinning? the best answer we know of is: "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Let us in this matter be contented with that which Calvin denominates "a sort of learned ignorance;" believing the fact that angels sinned on the testimony of the God of Truth, and at the same time ingenuously confessing our utter ignorance of the manner of the conception and birth of sin in angelic minds. The Origin of

Evil, or the reason why the Almighty, infinitely wise and good, allowed it to enter the minds of angels or men, may be called the only difficulty in theology; it belongs, however, rather to natural theology than to revealed: it is a question which, if we persist in endeavoring to investigate, may lead us to madness — or something worse. “Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God?” It is a question that should be left alone, because it is moral insanity for us to dream that we can fathom the depths of God’s mind, or discover what he has not revealed in his word: also because it lies far out of the grasp of the human understanding, and the attempts to explain it, from Origen to Beecher,* are decided failures; attempts on waxen wings to reach the sun.

As to the mode, however, in which the angels manifested the fact that they had become sinners, Jude gives a very significant hint. “Angels that kept not their principality, ἀρχήν, but left their own habitation” — 6 v. Their own habitation or dwelling-place, τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, means the world allotted and adapted to such intelligences as they. So when Judas Iscariot is said to have gone to his own place, it signifies the place appointed for and suited to such a sinner as he, Acts 1:25. The angels, it seems then, became dissatisfied with the world which God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, had appointed for them to dwell in; a world, too, adapted to give exercise and delight to all their faculties; and hence they left it, without divine permission, in a sullen, discontented and fault-finding temper of mind; as if they could select a better home for themselves than the only wise God. Besides, “they kept not their *principality*,”† they did not watch

* “The conflict of ages” will continue — until men, tented in clay, find a line and plummet long enough to ascertain the depth of that ocean which is boundless and fathomless. “Who, by searching, can find out God?” And whether the origin of evil will be explained when Christ comes, or whether any intelligent creature could comprehend it, if set forth in any language — is doubtful.

† See how the word is used, Rom. 8:38; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10, 15; Tit. 3:1. The marginal translation of Jude, 6 v. is therefore correct.

over the world where they had been appointed princes or rulers ; they disregarded the divine injunctions to teach and govern its inhabitants ; in insane envy, they threw up their commission. By thus abandoning their official station and dwelling-place they demonstrated that they had sinned ; they thus proved that they had “ that vaulting ambition which overleaps itself,” 1 Tim. 3 : 6 ; and plunges its possessor into hell.

Many theologians have assumed that the habitation of the angels before and up to the time when they sinned, was what is commonly called Heaven ; and they so teach their hearers, or readers. This opinion may be found in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, but there is not, so far as we are aware, a single passage of Holy Scripture to favor such an assumption. All that the Lord has been pleased to reveal is, that it was a dwelling-place or world destined for and adapted to angels, and that they voluntarily abandoned it, and the government of it with which they were invested ; but what particular part or world of the celestial dwelling-places it was, is not revealed.

God *spared not* angels who sinned ; or he severely punished them. As the judge of all, he took the rod of his justice in his hand, and, in using it, spared them not. Rom. 8 : 32 ; Gen. 18 : 24 ; Deut. 13 : 8 and 29 : 20 ; Ezek. 5 : 11. The metaphorical expression denotes that he treated them as their sin deserved, manifesting towards them justice unmingled with mercy. Compare Jas. 4 : 12 and 2 : 13. *But with chains of darkness hurled them into hell, i. e.* bound with chains of darkness. There is a metaphor in the expression, and the sense is : they are like criminals, but the chains wherewith they were bound are their own sinful temper and habits, with which misery is ever united. Prov. 5 : 21. “His own iniquities shall take (or ensnare) the sinner himself, and with the cords of his sin shall be holden,” (or, held fast) *i. e.* his own sinful disposition and habits shall be the means of his punishment. *Darkness* is often used in scripture to denote sin, with its inseparable companion, misery. “If we say that we

have communion with Him, and yet *walk in darkness*, we lie," or deceive ourselves: *i. e.* such profession means nothing, if we still habitually commit sin. 1 John 1: 6. There is *no darkness at all* in God. 1 John 1: 5; that is, no sin and no sadness. Compare 1 Pet. 2: 9. "Out of darkness into his wonderful light;" out of a state of sin and misery into a state of holiness and blessedness like that of God, (2 Pet. 1: 4.) See also Rom. 13: 12; Acts 26: 18. Chains or cords of darkness here, and cords of sin, (Prov. 5: 21,) are identical in signification. *Hurled* (or, cast) *them into hell*; with his almighty arm, guided by justice, he flung them into hell: the participle used is found only here, *ταῦτα ἁρῶσας*. "Having hurled them into hell, he delivered," etc.: which in our idiom is the same as, He hurled them into hell and delivered, etc. Thus 1 Peter 3: 19; "Having gone, he preached," he went and preached. The verb *ταῦτα ἁρῶν = ῥίπτειν εἰς τὰ ἅδταρον*, hurl into Tartarus or hell. Iliad 8: 13 sq. and 8: 477 sq. In later Greek usage Tartarus means the place of punishment, or hell.

In Luke 8: 31, and Rev. 29: 3, the place of punishment is called the abyss, the bottomless deep, rather than pit: a fathomless ocean, in which they are ever drowning, but never die. "O, how unlike the place from whence they fell!"

Homer represents Tartarus as a doleful prison or dungeon, from which there is no escape, and in which there is no joy; the light of the sun and cooling breezes being excluded. And our apostle, by declaring that the angels who sinned were cast into tartarus, evidently means that they were punished by being put into a doleful dungeon, or hurled from their former dwelling place into hell.

And delivered them up to be kept for judgment. God as judge gave them over to the proper officers, to be kept, reserved or secured, for trial and condemnation, when Christ comes, (9 v., Jude, 6 v.) The apostle speaks of them as infamous criminals, put in prison, and kept there for future trial and punishment. While

thus imprisoned in tartarus, bound with the cords of sin, the recollection of past offences, and the fearful looking for of the judgment to come, make their passions rage, thus producing present and constant torment: remorse and despair ever dwelling within them. But this punishment will be augmented when Christ shall confine them all in hell forever. 9-17 vs.; Jude, 6 v; Matt. 25: 41; Rev. 20: 10. (The common version, "delivered them into chains of darkness" is incorrect.) The sense accordingly is: God manifested his strict justice on angels that sinned, seizing them in their sins, and bound with the cords of their sinful temper and habits, hurled them from their former dwelling-place in this unholy and miserable condition into hell. If he thus dealt with them, how can false teachers, and their imitators, escape the judgment of God?

The reading $\sigma\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ is supported by G. K. Vulgate, and Syriac version; $\sigma\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$, by A. B. C. But $\sigma\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma = \sigma\iota\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$, means pits to keep grain in, and no one of good taste can suppose that the apostle employed it. The former reading is, in our judgment, alone genuine; and it is edited by Bengel, Griesbach, Bloomfield, and Tischendorf. It is moreover confirmed by $\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$. Jude, 6 v.

Where tartarus, hell, or the abyss, is, *is not revealed* in scripture. Some have childishly imagined it to be in the dark and cloudy atmosphere; others deep down in the earth; but since these are pure conjectures, built on no solid foundation, we may fling them aside as worthless, and be admonished that there *is* such a place, and that both angels that sinned and the finally impenitent shall inhabit it. Matt. 25: 41.

Demons wandered about the earth, when our Lord Jesus Christ appeared in Judea; and hence some have inferred that the angels who sinned could not *then* have been in that place of punishment where they shall everlastingly be confined, after the judgment of the great day. But if Luke (8: 31,) be carefully examined, that opinion must be given up. "And he besought him *that he would not command them*" (the many demons, 30 v.,)

“to go off into the abyss.” The demons feared that Christ would command them to go off from earth into tartarus, their proper prison; they begged therefore, for a longer reprieve, or that they might still be permitted to stay on earth. All this implies that they knew full well, they could not be prisoners at large without his permission; it also implies that others of their number were then, and are now, in hell.

V. 5. *And spared not the Old World*, the world before the flood; world, by metonymy for its inhabitants. All the antediluvians, eight alone excepted, are thus designated: and they are also described as *an ungodly world*. They were, probably, idolaters, inasmuch as Moses says, “The earth was corrupt before God,” Gen. 6: 11, with Ex. 32: 7, 8; Deut. 32: 5; Judges 2: 19. (See Ainsworth and Bush on Gen. 4: 26, and 6: 11.) The earth also was filled with violence, (Gen. 6: 11,) with violent wrong, or violent men. Lasciviousness was likewise a prevailing sin. Gen. 6: 1, 2. This example of God’s retributive justice is very pertinent to our apostle’s purpose, falling with a crushing weight on them who by words or deeds deny their Redeemer to be their Sovereign, and who teach or practice lewdness. God brought the flood on an ungodly world; the number of the transgressors did not prevent him from severely punishing them, and hence the multitudes that follow false teachers must not expect exemption from punishment. *But guarded Noah*, ἐφύλαξε, flung over him the shield of his Almighty love, safely secured him and his, in the ark. Gen. 7: 16. (Comp. 1 Pet. 3: 20.) *One of eight*, ὀγδὼν, he and seven others. Odys. 9: 335. ἐγὼ πῆμπυον, I and four others. *A preacher of righteousness*: while Noah was building the ark, he had many opportunities to remind the old world of that which was right for them to do in consequence of their relations and obligations to the Most High: also of that which was right for God to do, provided they continued in open rebellion against him. “Noah,” says Calvin, “was a preacher of righteousness, because he endeavored to restore to a sound mind

an exceedingly wicked world; and this he did, not only by teaching and holy exhortations, but by toiling anxiously for a hundred and twenty years in building the ark. Moreover it is the apostle's design to put before our eyes God's wrath against the reprobate in such a manner as to exhort us to the imitation of the holy." For God saved Noah, *when he brought the flood on an ungodly world*; he saved the righteous and destroyed the wicked at the same time, manifesting both his tender mercy and justice. And when our Lord comes as judge, God will not have lost his immutability. (The aor. part, ἐπαΐας, denotes the suddenness of the act; 'when he suddenly brought,' etc.: compare Luke 17: 27-29.)

V. 6. *And when he burned to ashes the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah*: when he suddenly or unexpectedly did it, τετραΐας. The "cities of Sodom and Gomorrah" are used, by Synecdoche, to include the rest, Admah and Zeboim. There is also a metonymy; for the cities were not only destroyed but also their inhabitants, Gen. 19: 24, 25; Deut 29: 23; Jude, 7 v. *By the overthrow he condemned them*. "Like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger and in his wrath," Deut. 29: 23. God is angry at sinners, not at wood and brick; and he *condemned* or punished the inhabitants for their abominable iniquity: and he did it by a signal *overthrow*, the manner of their death being indicative of his wrath, or calm and holy determination to punish the incorrigible. By the overthrow of the cities, God as judge doomed to hell their inhabitants. So the same verb, condemn, is used, (Mark 16: 16,) "He that believeth not shall be condemned," the opposite of "shall be saved." And so did *Jude* understand it; for he says they are suffering the punishment of everlasting fire. (Comp. Matt. 25: 41, 46; 2 Thess. 1: 9.) *Setting them forth as an example to them who shall live ungodly*: exhibiting them in his word as a pattern, sign or symbol, of his retributive justice, and as a warning of the destruction which shall overtake all

future despisers of God as Lord. See Deut. 29: 23; Ps. 11: 5, 6; Rev. 14: 10; 19: 20; 21: 8. (In the last passage the symbol is explained as "the second death," or future punishment of an awful kind.) The phrase ὁ πόδες ἡγμά τειθεὶς ὡς = πόδες ἡγμά τειθεὶς, Jude, 7 v.

The plain in which these cities were built was, in fertility and beauty of scenery, as the garden of the Lord; Gen. 13: 10. But though the country was like Eden, yet the men of Sodom, and the other cities, were wicked, and sinners before the Lord exceedingly, Gen. 13: 13; Jude, 7 v. Moses describes them as utterly regardless of good order, shameless and lawless; and as given in mass to the most abominable and unnatural licentiousness, Gen. 19. Compare Ezek. 16: 49: 50.

V. 7. *And yet he rescued righteous Lot, worn out by the lascivious behaviour of the lawless: καὶ=and yet: it was no blind indiscriminate wrath; it did not destroy the righteous with the wicked; Gen. 18: 23, etc. Compare the use of καὶ, Mark 7: 28; 1 Cor. 5: 11. Worn out, etc.: the participle signifies strictly worn out by labor, and hence, metaphorically, sick at heart, utterly discouraged and disgusted, as in Acts 7: 24. It also assigns or gives the reason why Peter calls Lot righteous. The best version therefore is: "He reserved righteous Lot, since he was worn out," etc. By the lascivious behaviour of the lawless, or, oppressed under the behaviour of the lawless consisting in lasciviousness. He who is heart-broken because of the manifestation of sinful propensities in others, shows that he does not like sin himself, Ps. 119: 136. If Lot had taken pleasure in witnessing the outbreaks of their depravity, he would not have been righteous, but a vile sinner deserving the same punishment as the rest, Rom. 1: 32. The true character of a man is to be determined, not by rare or occasional acts at variance with his general course of living, but by his uniform temper and doings; otherwise, neither Lot nor Sarah could have been called righteous or holy, 1 Pet. 3: 5, 6. The verb ἐρρύσατο, he snatched away,*

or rescued, delivered from the impending ruin with the gentle violence of love, (Gen. 19: 16,) is elegantly put at the end of the sentence, in order to fasten the attention especially on Lot's merciful deliverance. "And yet righteous Lot, since he was worn out by the lascivious behaviour of these lawless persons, he snatched away." So also in the following verse. The same rhetorical arrangement, or *lucidus ordo*, is found in the first epistle, 1 Pet. 27: 15. (That the flow of thought in this chapter is decidedly Petrine, is evident from 1 Pet. 4: 1-5; for this chapter is only an expansion, so to speak, of that passage.)

V. 8. *For that righteous one dwelling among men, by seeing and hearing, tormented his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds.* This is added to illustrate more fully his sickness of heart, while he dwelt among them, the only healthy person among a plague-stricken mob. Heart-broken indeed he was, for, while living among them and witnessing the manifestations of their monstrous profligacy, he put his happiness thereby daily on the rack. His mental anguish was produced *by seeing* what they did, and *hearing* what their unclean lips uttered, and these words, in the original, are put in the front of the sentence to fix attention on the manner in which his peace of mind was constantly disturbed; but the verb *tormented* at the end, to show that his was no common distress, but such only as the righteous suffer in similar circumstances.

V. 9, 10. [If these things be so, then] *the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous for the day of judgment to be punished; but especially those who walk after the flesh in filthy lust, and despise government.* Here, as before stated, apodosis begins. Before οἶδεν, ἄρα or ἄρα οὖν is implied, Rom. 5: 18. After εἰ in a conditional clause, ἄρα begins the apodosis, Matt. 12: 28; 1 Cor. 15: 16-18; Gal. 2: 21. Peter omits the sign of the apodosis here and in 20 v., as is quite natural to such a fervent spirit, borne onward by the strength of his emotions. "For if God spared not angels who sinned, etc., then

the Lord knows," etc. For this is rendered more perspicuous to the mere English reader by supplying as above. The verb to know, in connection with the infinitive, implies also both ability and willingness. "The Lord has all the knowledge and power requisite to deliver them, and is unchangeably determined to do so." Compare Matt. 7: 11. "If ye then *know how to give* good gifts," etc., *i. e.*, If ye know their wants, have power or resources to supply them, and a heart disposed so to do. 1 Tim. 3: 5; Phil. 4: 12.

To rescue the godly from trial or snatch them away from it, is to deliver them from a state of trial in which their fidelity to the Lord, their faith and patience, are put to the proof, or tested like gold in the fire. 1 Pet. 1: 7. While dwelling among the wicked, "as lambs in the midst of wolves," the pious have abundant opportunities to manifest their love of truth and holiness, and their hatred of destructive heresies and sins. When false teachers arise among them, and the love of many waxes cold; when many put on the form of piety, but are strangers to its power; "the Lord trieth the righteous" to make it unquestionable, that they truly love Him, and esteem His word above all; Deut. 13: 3; 2 Pet. 2: 1 with 9 v.; 1 Cor. 11: 19; 1 Pet. 1: 6, 7; 4: 12. But this state of trial is to last only till "the day of judgment;" till Christ comes as Judge and separates the one from the other. Matt. 13: 40-43.

To keep the unrighteous for the day of judgment to be punished, means to watch over or secure them, reserve them to be punished at the day of judgment: comp. 1 Pet. 1: 4; 2 Pet. 2: 4. They are reserved for that Great Day; that is the epoch in which the Lord has determined that they shall be judged and punished more severely than when in the separate or disembodied state. Matt. 25: 41, 46; 2 Thess. 1: 7-10. It is Christ's day in which he shall come again to earth and appear in his glory, attended by all his holy angels, and sit down on his glorious throne, Matt. 25: 31; the day when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from

heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, giving retribution to them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall suffer punishment, everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, etc., in that day." 2 Thess. 1: 7-10. "The Father judgeth no one, but hath committed all judgment to the Son." John 5: 22; Acts 17: 31; 1 Cor. 4: 5. And this appears to be the reason why the apostle uses "Lord," and not "God," as in the 4 v. "God, in the person of our Lord, is able and willing to deliver the godly from a state of trial, and to confine safely the wicked to be punished at the day of judgment." *Εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως*=up to the day of judgment, when it has come, or, for that time: comp. 1 Pet. 1: 11; 2 Pet. 3: 7; 1 Thess. 4: 15. Our apostle also alludes to what he said before of the false teachers and their followers; "Denying that their Redeemer is Sovereign." "Such a denial is vain, as they will discover when he as Lord and Judge comes to punish them and others of like character."

But especially these, etc.; here the apodosis ends. The sense is, But the Lord knows how to keep for the day of judgment, to be punished in an especial manner, the leaders and guides who entice others, by word and deed, to imitate their abominable actions. He brands them, says Calvin, with two marks, filthy lust and contempt of government. *To walk after the flesh in filthy lust*, is habitually to indulge the bodily appetites in all sorts of lewdness, as fornication, adultery, and unnatural sensual practices. Compare Jude 7 v.; 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10; Rom. 1: 27, 32. *To despise government*, is to speak contemptuously of it to endeavor to overthrow legal and judicial authority; and, when that can not be done by the lawless, to use shameful efforts to lessen in men's minds reverence for law, and for them who are appointed to execute it. Such men, in the nineteenth century, are like moral descendants of the inhabitants of the Plain. Filthy lust and contempt of government are still their characteristic features.

(Gen. 19: 9.) Not only the family, and the church, but *the State* also *is of divine institution*, Rom. 13: 1-7; 1 Pet. 2: 13-16; and for men to treat civil government with contempt, because they wish to gratify to the full their vile, shameless, and filthy appetites, is to oppose God himself, in the present government of this world; it evinces, moreover, such a love of sin as deserves extreme punishment, and which the apostle here predicts shall be certainly executed.

¹⁰Fool-hardy, self-willed men! they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities: ¹¹whereas angels, who are greater in strength and power, bring not against them an evil-spoken judgment, when standing before the Lord. ¹²But these, as irrational sensual animals, which are made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of things they do not understand, and, in consequence of their corruption, shall be destroyed, ¹³receiving the wages of unrighteousness; inasmuch as they think that luxury in day-light is pleasure: spots and blemishes! living luxuriously, while in consequence of their deceits they feast with you; ¹⁴since they have eyes filled with an adulteress, and that ceases not from sin, insnaring unestablished souls; since they have a heart trained in covetousness — children of curse! ¹⁵because they have forsaken the right way, wandered, and followed the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness; ¹⁶but he had a refutation of his transgression, when the dumb ass spoke in a voice like men, and restrained the prophet's madness.

V. 10. *Fool-hardy* *τολμαζαί* = *clavers*, over-bold men, who show what they call their courage at the expense of good sense and decency; venturesome persons who bridle not their tongues even when the prison and gallows are in sight. *Self-willed* men, *αὐθαδέις*, *self-pleasing*, or self-conceited; hence self-willed or obstinate, regardless of the rights or feelings of others, those of the highest earthly dignity not excepted; nay, they delight to spurt their filth all around the pillars of the state. *Stat eorum Voluntas pro Ratione et Lege et Scriptura*. They will have their way and their say, notwithstanding reason and law and Holy Scripture alike forbid it — mulish heroes!

With these words the apostle begins his *more particular description of the false teachers*, which is continued to the first

clause of the seventeenth verse inclusive; while, as he proceeds with the description, he repeats the *certainly* of their future punishment, and shows or illustrates how richly deserved or *just* such punishment will be.

They are not afraid to speak of dignities: literally, "they tremble not speaking evil of glories," *i. e.* they tremble not in so doing, or they are not afraid to revile them. Δόξα, glories, excellencies, honors or dignities: the same word is used in the plural also in 1 Pet. 1: 11: "the glories after these sufferings," his honors subsequent to his passion, as the head of all principality and power, 1 Pet. 3: 22. Here the same word is used by metonymy for men in places of honor; "honors" for honorable men, or magistrates.* This mode of interpretation agrees well with what precedes: "They despise Government, these self-willed heroes! You cannot discern any trembling of their nerves when employed in their ordinary occupation, reviling persons invested with honor; or those appointed to uphold the state and enforce its laws." Compare Jude, 8 v.

Calvin: "After the apostle had said, they despise government, he indicates the source of the evil, viz: 'because they are *fool-hardy* and *self-willed*. Lastly, in order to heighten the more their haughtiness, he says, They tremble not when they speak evil of glories. For it is a mark of wonderful arrogance to count as nothing worth, that glory which shines brightly in the orders appointed by God. For it is beyond doubt that he designates by this name, the military and civil authorities, or magistrates supreme and subordinate, (*imperia et magistratus designet*.) For although there is no honest kind of life but what is praise-worthy, still we know that the function of magistrates is the most eminent, because they are God's vicegerants in governing mankind."

The fanatical Anabaptists of the sixteenth century were precisely such men as the apostle here describes; and the Papal

* When an advocate in our courts begins his address to the presiding Judge, he commonly says "May it please your Honor."

church has always despised government and spoken evil of dignities, except when she could mould them as clay to suit her own ambitious schemes.

V. 11. *Whereas, angels, who are greater in strength and power, bring not against them an evil-spoken judgment, when standing before the Lord.* Peter's aim, in these words, is to expose the moral ugliness of their effrontery; and this he does by contrasting their ribald speeches against magistrates with the calm, truthful and respectful demeanor of the holy angels in similar circumstances. *Whereas ὅπου, where*, equivalent either to *since*, 1 Cor. 3: 3; or to *in which condition or circumstances*, Col. 3: 11. "*Where* there is neither Jew nor Gentile," etc.: *i. e.*, in which condition (the condition of men as renewed, Col. 3: 10,) there are no national distinctions. Heb. 9: 16, "For *where* a testament (or covenant) is," etc., *i. e.* on that condition, or in such circumstances. "These self-willed heroes despise dominion, and revile dignities; angels, however, when in like circumstances, act very differently." *Who are greater in strength and power*: *Asteismus gravis, majores homunculis*, says Bengel. "Bless Jehovah, ye his angels, *mighty* ones of *strength* (=powerful heroes,) that do his command," etc., Ps. 103: 20. These fool-hardy and self-willed men, who think that they manifest their courage by reviling dignities, are very much mistaken; for angels in like circumstances act very differently, and they are heroes indeed, displaying moral boldness in obeying God well worthy of human imitation. They are indeed far superior to the most eloquent false teachers and evil-speaking orators of sedition and anarchy. T. Smith explains this clause thus: "Angels of great power, and the most excellent beings created by God; for excellence is derived from power, according to common conception:"—*excellentia enim sumitur a potentia juxta vulgi conceptum*. Whitby, Benson, and others: 'Who are greater in power than the fallen angels.' When holy angels are compared with men generally, they must be allowed to be far superior in intellectual and moral

endowments; even the wisest and best of mankind are weak and imperfect creatures when compared with those mighty ones of strength who do God's command, listening for the least intimations of his will, Ps. 103: 20. When holiness and intellect are combined, then intelligent beings are strong; when such have never sinned, then they are "*greater in strength and power*" than those who have. From this point of view, in our judgment, these words of the apostle must be interpreted. (What he says here is indeed equally true if explained of the angels that sinned; but we think that interpretation would never have been resorted to, had not expositors *supposed* that 2 Pet. 2: 11, and Jude 9 v. were parallel in signification.) Now, if angels thus excel the wisest and holiest men in strength and power, how far superior must they be to the miserable men portrayed by the apostle — wretches overpowered by lasciviousness, avarice and foolish ambition! This interpretation so briefly hinted at by Bengel, is perfectly consistent with the preceding and subsequent context, 10: 12 vs. For, says the apostle, 'they are exceedingly lascivious persons, and despise dominion or government;' not that surely with which angels are invested, but that entrusted to men. 'Fool-hardy and self-willed!' or obstinate and impudent men whose passions blind their judgment, and impel them to treat with abuse and slander those who are appointed to uphold the state and enforce its laws. But angels, when they speak of magistrates, never utter words of vituperation. These men, however, like animals, let their passions drive them to destruction. The word "angels," accompanied by no descriptive word or phrase, means the holy angels. Comp. Matt. 4: 11; 1 Pet. 1: 12. (Here, however, they are described or defined as "*greater in strength and power*"; the allusion being to Ps. 103: 20.)

Angels bring not against them an evil-spoken judgment, when standing before the Lord: οὐ φέρουσι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίου βλάβεσθμον κρίσιν. The sense is: When angels report to the Lord the doings of magistrates on earth, they never, no matter

how great may be the sins of the earthly dignities, utter an abusive sentence against them; or, they never express their judgment about them in insolent or slanderous words, as false teachers and their followers do.

Calvin: "At that time almost all magistrates were impious and bloody enemies of the church. The angels therefore, who are the guardians of the church, must have hated them. The apostle however says that men deserving of hatred and execration are so condemned by them as to show respect to divinely-appointed authority. Such moderation, says Peter, there is in the angels; but these wretches in hot haste utter without trembling dissolute and unbridled revilings." T. Smith: "Angels refrain from such revilings *against them, i. e.,* against magistrates."

Angels *bring not an evil-spoken judgment*, or, they bear not such a judgment: *κρίσις* means judgment, opinion expressed respecting the moral character of earthly dignities, according to Calvin, and, by implication, unfavorable judgment or condemnation; disapproval of it, and *ὁ βλάσφημος*, without reviling: compare the use of *κρίμα*, (Matt. 7: 2,) and *κρίσις*, John 7: 24. Our translators take it in the sense of *accusation*; but then it should have been *κατηγορία* or *αἰτία*, (as in Luke 6: 7; John 18: 29; 1 Tim. 5: 19; Tit. 1: 6; Mark 15: 26; Acts 25: 18,) *αἰτίωμα* or *αἰτιώμα*, as in Acts 25: 7; for neither of which is there any manuscript authority; nor can the meaning "accusation" be justified by usage. That signification of the word therefore, must be abandoned. We take *κρίσις* to mean judgment, not in the judicial sense, for God in Christ is alone judge and law-giver, (Jas. 4: 12;) but as an expression of opinion by angels as to the acts or moral character of magistrates. The angels *bring* (*bear* or *carry*) a *judgment*, or express and report in their language, (1 Cor. 13: 1,) what they have observed or learned of dignities here. "If any one comes to you, and *brings not* this doctrine," etc., 2 John, 11 v. Now, if one had brought the doctrine in his

heart he could not but speak it, as Peter and John in substance say, Acts 4: 20. And when our apostle here says, "*Angels bring not against them an evil-spoken judgment,*" he means thereby that they never declare it in language which is disrespectful to magistrates, or which is not in all respects truthful. This is confirmed by Jude, 9 v.: for he uses *ἐπενεργεῖν* = *to bring forward*, utter; thus showing how he understood this expression of Peter.

The phrase *παρὰ κυρίου* is here rendered by our translators *before the Lord*, and the cognate expression *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ* "*before God,*" (Rom. 2: 13,) "*in the sight of God,*" (Gal. 3: 11;) but generally "*with God,*" as in Rom. 2: 11; 9: 14; 1 Cor. 3: 19. (Comp. Eph. 6: 9.) In 2 Pet. 3: 8, "*with the Lord.*" Both expressions generally mean in his sight, judgment or decision, as in 1 Pet. 2: 4. "*In God's sight select (choice,) precious.*" 1 Pet. 2: 20, "*This is grace in God's sight;*" in his judgment, it is a graceful exhibition of true kindness. "*One day with the Lord (in his sight) is as a thousand years;*" in his judgment of time, a millennium and a day are alike. And, if this phrase be a part of the genuine text of Peter, as we believe, then the sense either is: '*Angels, however, in similar circumstances, as the Lord is judge, utter not any vituperative language against magistrates;*' or, it signifies *when standing before the Lord*, they express or report no such judgment against them: *παρὰ κυρίου* = *near to the Lord*, standing before him; which we prefer, with Barnes. See Job. 1: 6, and 2: 1.

In favor of *παρὰ κυρίου* are B. C. G. K. For its omission, A. and ten manuscripts (cursive.) Tischendorf and Lachmann omit the phrase. Griesbach considers the evidence not sufficient to justify its expulsion from the text. Bengel, Hahn, and Bloomfield consider the expression genuine. In the Vulgate, and Syriac version, the words are omitted.

But *to whom* do the angels speak of dignities? To the Lord Christ, or standing before him as "*the head of all principality and power.*" If any think it strange that the holy angels are

represented by the apostle as reporting to our Lord the doings of magistrates here, such may be reminded of what is written, Heb. 1: 14, and 2: 5. For how can angels be ministering spirits to the pious on earth, without becoming acquainted with the acts of the dignities here? And when they return to give an account of their embassy, why may they not bring forward the plain unvarnished truth, not only respecting the saints, but those magistrates also, who have oppressed or who still oppress the disciples of Christ? Why should this be deemed incredible? Besides, if "the future habitable earth," (Heb. 2: 5,) be not subjected to angels, does not that form of speech imply that the present habitable earth is? Compare Rev. 1: 1; 2: 16.

They who think that the apostle intended to show, that the holy angels do not revile the fallen angels say, that by simply exchanging the rough for the smooth breathing, ἀντ'αυ for ἀντ'αυτ, that thought is elicited: 'Bring not *against themselves*,' originally of their number; but the evidence for this, derived from manuscripts, versions and church-fathers is so very slight, that it is rejected even by Lachmann.

Neither is the passage, (Jude, 9 v.,) strictly speaking, parallel to the one before us. Peter speaks of *angels*, Jude of *Michael the archangel*: Peter speaks of angels bringing forward a truthful and respectful narrative or report to the Lord Jesus of the *mal-administration of magistrates on earth*; Jude, of a *debate* in which Satan and Michael were engaged *with reference to the body of Moses*, in which debate Michael used no scurrillous language even to the Devil. So striking are the differences; and the two passages agree only in the fact, that when a good angel speaks of any transgressor, of earth or hell, he never plays the part of a ribald or buffoon.

Jude, it is likely, took the account he gives of the controversy between Michael and Satan from some oral or written tradition, then relied on by the perverters of the gospel in the community of Christians which he addressed. He simply attacks such with

their own weapons, or appeals to a story they believed, or professed to believe as true, and thus shows, on their own principles and from their own sources of evidence, that they who revile dignities are without excuse. It is a clever argumentum ad hominem, and none can prove from this allusion to it by Jude, that he believed it to be either true or false.

Bengel: *Apud Dominum*. Judicem, eumque præsentem, re-veriti, abstinent judicio. But Peter says not that they abstain from judgment, but from an evil-spoken one.

¹²*But these, as irrational sensual animals which are made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of things that they do not understand, and, in consequence of their corruption, shall be destroyed,* ¹³*receiving the wages of unrighteousness.*

V. 12. ‘Angels never revile dignities, but these fool-hardy and self-willed men, throw the reins on the neck of their lusts; their passions and appetites drive them like wild beasts into destruction; a destruction that shall certainly be executed by the Lord Jesus on the day of Judgment, (9 v.) and which is richly deserved in consequence of their moral corruption.’ They who despise government and speak evil of those appointed to uphold the state and enforce its laws, show an insatiable liking for sin; their moral corruption often leads them to the prison and gallows here, and if they repent not, a worse prison awaits them hereafter.

As irrational sensual animals, ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα, φυσιζα; both ἄλογα and φυσιζα are descriptive adjectives qualifying ζῶα. The word rendered *irrational* means speechless or reasonless; we prefer “irrational,” for to express dumb or speechless, Peter uses ἄφωνον, 16. (Compare 1 Pet. 2: 2; Rom. 12: 1, Gr.) *Sensual*, literally, *natural*; guided by the nature which animals have, whose appetites are a law to them, since reason is withheld from them. But when men put their passions to the helm, while reason and conscience are fast asleep, then they must make shipwreck of their well-being in time and in eternity. *Which are made to be taken and destroyed*: literally, “Born for seizure and corruption;”

that is, physical corruption or death, such corruption as befalls animals, which, whether wild or tame, were made by God to be taken and killed by men for their sustenance or safety, Gen. 9: 1-3. Some connect *natural* with the following words, taking it adverbially: 'But these, as irrational animals, *naturally born* for seizure and corruption': it would, however puzzle any one but a learned commentator or critic to demonstrate how either men or animals can be born except naturally.

Speak evil of things that they do not understand, or, speak evil of things that they know nothing of: ἐν οἷς ἀγνοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες: ἐν οἷς=ἐν τοῦτοις, ᾧ. 'They insolently babble on matters which they know nothing of.' "They revile the acts of magistrates," says Benson, "ignorant of the secret springs or motives of their conduct: they know nothing of the arcana imperii," which reviles acts from the impulse of fierce passions only, attacking dignities as wild beasts rush on their enemies: but they are *irrational* in so doing; for without Government and Dignities, our world would soon become an Aeeldama, and exhibit a vivid picture of Hell, where all are "hateful and hating one another."

And, in consequence of their corruption, shall be destroyed: literally, "And in their corruption shall be corrupted." Corruption means gross moral depravity or wickedness, as in the nineteenth verse, and 1: 4. *In* their corruption signifies, In consequence of their corruption, as in 1: 4; 1 Pet. 4: 14. The verb *shall be corrupted* is equivalent to shall be destroyed; (compare Gen. 6: 12, 13; Heb.) A similar sudden change of meaning occurs 1 Cor. 3: 17. If any one corrupt the temple of God, him *will* God corrupt," i. e. destroy; καὶ φθαρήσονται, A. B. C.* καὶ αὐφθαρήσονται, C.** G. K. Tischendorf and Lachmann edit the former reading, Griesbach and Bengel, the latter.

Receiving the wages of unrighteousness: or carrying off the wages of unrighteousness. This clause must be connected with the preceding one: "And shall, in consequence of their corruption, be destroyed, receiving the wages of unrighteousness;" i. e.

they shall certainly be punished, and punished justly, receiving the payment or retribution they have earned by their enormous wickedness. "The wages of sin is Death, but the gift of God is Eternal Life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 23. "*Bringing on themselves* swift destruction," 1 v. That the sins of men are the proximate causes of their condemnation, is the uniform doctrine of Scripture. T. Smith: *Male hæc verba a precedentibus sejunguntur: poenam, quam impietate sua merentur, subibunt.* The participle here used by Peter is the future middle of the so-called Attic form: *χοιτοῦμενοι*. In the active voice *χοιτίζω* means to take up and bear away (for another), *bring*, Luke 7: 37. Elsewhere it is found in middle voice, meaning to take up and bear away for one's self, or bring on one's self, *i. e. receive*. Thus, Matt. 25: 27: "Thou shouldst therefore have put out my money to the exchangers, and then, when I come, *I would have received* my own with interest." 2 Cor. 5: 10. "For we must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, in order that each *may receive*," etc. Col. 3: 25. "For he that doeth wrong *shall receive* for the wrong which he hath done; and hence there is no partiality." 1 Pet. 1: 9. "*Receiving* the end" (ultimate result, or final gracious recompense,) of your faith, your personal salvation." 1 Pet. 5: 9. "And, when the Chief Shepherd has appeared, *ye shall receive* the crown of glory that cannot fade;" take up and bear away for yourselves as conquerors, that crown. So here 'In consequence of their wickedness they shall certainly be punished, and that justly, for *they shall receive the wages of unrighteousness*, or bring on themselves that punishment which their sins deserve.' They shall have to take up and carry a dreadful burden, made up of an accusing conscience and a sense of the wrath of God. For "the worm that dieth not," is a perpetually accusing conscience, and the "fire that is not quenched" is the fearful indignation of the Holy, Immutable and Almighty Judge. Mark 9: 48, with John 3: 36; Rom. 2: 5-11; 9: 22; Eph. 5: 6; Rev. 6: 17, 17; 14: 10, 11; Matt. 25: 41;

Heb. 10: 27. *And how can the incorrigibly depraved escape from his hands, or break the prison doors of hell? How can they flee from themselves?* Let the chief English poet of the Satanic School, illustrate the mode of "receiving the wages of unrighteousness":

"The mind that broods o'er guilty woes,
Is like the scorpion girt by fire,
In circle narrowing as it glows;
Till fully searched by thousand throes,
And maddening in her ire,
One sole and sad relief she knows —
The sting she nourished for her foes,
Whose venom never proved in vain,
And darts it into her desperate brain.
So do the dark in soul expire:
Or live, like scorpion, girt by fire.
So withers the soul *remorse* hath riven,
Unloved of earth, unblessed of heaven;
Darkness above, despair beneath,
Around it flame, within it death."

But some deceive themselves and others with vain words, or false and meaningless doctrines, (Eph. 5: 6,) affirming that the future destruction of the wicked consists in annihilation. We answer that it is the destruction, not of being, but of well-being. The Judge of all, must know all about this awful subject, and he cannot lie. What is his determination and declaration on this subject? He declares, in the most striking, perspicuous, and fearful language, that it *does not* consist in annihilation. "Where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire *is not quenched*. *For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt,*" Mark 9: 48, 49. Here we are explicitly told that the finally impenitent and incorrigibly wicked shall not lose their immortality; their conscience is immortal, and so must be their other mental faculties: while the purpose of the Judge, and his holy indignation against their sins, is a fire unquenchable or immutable, from which escape is impossible. For every one shall be preserved in being by the almighty power and just displeasure

of the Judge, (Deut. 4: 24; Heb. 12: 29,) and every victim of the divine justice shall be preserved in being everlasting. ("Shall be salted with salt"=shall be preserved with preservation; an intensive form of speech to denote everlasting existence.) And that the body will partake of the punishment, is also explicitly told us by "the Judge of all the earth," Matt. 10: 28.

Men bring this destruction on themselves, inasmuch as their moral corruption is the procuring proximate cause of it, (2: 1, 12.) "God in Christ" brings it on them, and keeps them immortal to endure it, as the holy, truthful, just, omnipotent and unchangeable Judge, 2: 5, 9, 10.

To assume that the lost in hell will, in some future age after the judgment of the great day, be renewed by the Holy Spirit, is "destructive heresy." *There is not the faintest intimation of such a doctrine in all the sacred Word. Men may and do deceive us, but God cannot.* And what are mere human opinions and conjectures worth to a soul exchanging time for eternity? What must be thought of them by those whose destiny is unalterably fixed? "Be not deceived; God is not mocked:" (he is not one to be scorned or sneered at) "for whatever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; for he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting," Gal. 6: 7-8. Here life everlasting is contrasted with corruption, or endless blessedness with endless misery, and it is declared that no other recompense awaits the unholy and holy. And in Matt. 25: 41, the same word, "everlasting," is used to express the duration of the bliss of the righteous and the misery of the wicked.

Inasmuch as they think that luxury in daylight is pleasure—spots and blemishes! living luxuriously, while in consequence of their deceits they feast with you. The apostle is illustrating the justice of their punishment: 'In consequence of their moral corruption they shall be destroyed, receiving the wages of un-

righteousness; inasmuch as they esteem,' etc. The participle "thinking," is employed to assign a reason of the preceding statement, instances of which have been before noticed, 1: 14. "*Knowing* that," etc., since I know, 2: 7. "Righteous Lot, *worn out*," *i. e.*, since he was worn out, 3: 11. "All these things, then, *being dissolvable*," *i. e.*, inasmuch as they are so constituted. (Compare 1 Pet. 1: 22, 23.) And so also in 14, 15 vs. *Luxury in daylight*, $\tau\eta\gamma \ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\ \pi\rho\omega\gamma\eta\gamma$, does not mean daily luxury, quotidianas delicias, as Beza translates; neither does it mean luxury summed up in a day, or brief and transitory luxury, as others explain; nor does it signify their luxury on the day in which the love-feasts were celebrated, as Bengel suggests; but "in the daytime," or in daylight, as our translators rightly judged. So it is used also in 1: 19. "Until daylight break through," or the day dawn. *Luxury* means a soft, effeminate and epicurean way of living; an excessive use of rich food and choice wines, with an undue regard for costly raiment, Luke 7: 25. Paul in a parallel passage, describes in a homely manner such idol worship, Phil. 3: 19. See also Isa. 4: 11, 12; 28: 7. Such heretical fops and epicurean false teachers deserve severe punishment; for they live, not to guide their disciples in the way of life, not to serve God or benefit men, but to eat and drink and dress—that is all. And "inasmuch as they think that luxury in daylight is *pleasure*," (*i. e.*, the chief good, or the next thing to it,) "they shall be destroyed, receiving the wages of unrighteousness." The ancients generally feasted in the night; luxury in the day time therefore denotes uncommon excess in this particular, Acts 2: 15; 1 Thess. 5: 7.

Spots and blemishes! An outburst of holy indignation, as in 10 v. Here are two elliptical metaphors, equivalent to 'These are spots and blemishes,' and the sense is: These, like filthy spots on garments and blemishes on the human body, are a disgrace and dishonor to the church of Christ, under this dispensation of his grace. (Compare Eph. 5: 27; Lev. 21: 16, etc.) *Living lux-*

viously, living like epicures, though professing to be Christians ; (LXX. Isa. 55 : 2 ; Jas. 5 : 5 ;) not “sporting themselves,” unless that expression means luxurious self-indulgence : the allusion in this word, ἐντροφῶντες, is not to their licentiousness, but to the worship of the dining-table, or what the great English poet calls “sumptuous gluttonies and gorgeous feasts.” *In consequence of their deceits, i. e., hypocritical stratagems, and seemingly holy words.* “Lepers in saintly garb !” “With good words and fair speeches they deceive the hearts of the simple,” Rom. 16 : 18. *While they feast with you :* comp. Jude, 12 v. The reference in these words is either to the agapæ or love-feasts ; feasts to which the wealthier brethren chiefly contributed, and in which the disciples, rich and poor together, met to partake of what was originally but a frugal meal, in token of their brotherly love. See Jude, 12 v. Compare 1 Cor. 11 : 21, 22. We have the testimony of a heathen who had the best opportunities of judging, Pliny the younger, that the Agapæ, (or Lord’s supper, or both,) were then innocently observed by Christians in Asia Minor : Cibum simul capiebant, promiscuum tamen et innocuum. (Compare Tertullian, Apolog. cap. 39.) But the appearance of false teachers in the church, and the great success they met with, in accordance with the apostle’s prediction, (2 : 1, 2,) led to the non-observance of them altogether. Or the reference in the words “while they feast with you,” is to the love-feasts and the Lord’s supper, which were both observed in the apostolic age by professed Christians. (The Lord’s supper however, is alone of divine institution, 1 Cor. 11 : 23–26.) And it is probable, as Doddridge suggests, that the apostle’s design is to show that false teachers would live luxuriously at home and among those like themselves, not among their dupes ; while, on other occasions, or when the Agapæ and Lord’s supper were observed, their hypocrisy would impel them to play the part of saints by banquetting with them at these pious festivals. How else could they keep up even the appearance of piety ? What becomes of their deceitful words and

stratagems, if this be not assumed? And does not the whole history of the church demonstrate such hypocrisy to be an unquestionable fact? Accordingly the sense of this verse is: 'They shall be justly punished, inasmuch as they think that excessive luxury is the chief good—vile men bringing reproach on the church of Christ! Living constantly in luxury in their private dwellings, with others of the same corrupt mind, and "blind guides" like themselves; while in the public religious assemblies, they banquet with you at the supper of the Lord, and at feasts indicative of fraternal love.' (This interpretation is based on the fact that the participle, *συνεσθωχοῦμενοι*, "feasting with you," expresses *a condition*, or rather *a supposition* assumed as true by the apostle, as in 1: 20; 3: 3.) A.* C. G. K. for the common reading *απαταις*, B. *αγαταις*. Jude has: "These are breakers in your agapæ," concealed rocks among those who meet to testify their brotherly love, (12 v.) or dangerous men who covertly lead and dash others to destruction, causing them to make shipwreck of faith and a good conscience, 1 Tim. 1: 19. The MSS. evidence for the common reading is decidedly preponderating; while the translation of the thirteenth verse in the Vulgate Latin and Syriac versions, is too paraphrastic and confused to suffice for elucidation. Neither is the fact that Jude has agapæ, any decisive proof that the same word was here used by Peter, unless it could be demonstrated that Jude was but a slavish copyist, which can never be done, since he has striking expressions peculiarly his own: *e. g.*, "*Breakers in your love-feasts*;" "*waterless clouds wind-driven*; *trees leafless*, (unfruitful or fruitless, 2 Pet. 1: 8,) *twice dead and uprooted*; *wild waves of the sea foaming up their own indecencies*; *wandering stars*; to mention no others, 12, 13 vs. The common reading "deceits" must therefore be retained as genuine; and it is accordingly so edited by Tischendorf, Griesbach, Bengel, Bloomfield and Hahn.

V. 14. *Since they have eyes filled with an adulteress, and that cease not from sin, insinuating unestablished souls.* Their punish-

ment is just, not only because of their excessive luxury and hypocrisy, (13 v.,) but also because of their lasciviousness. *Εχοντες*, having=since they have. *Eyes filled with*, or full of, *an adulteress*, ὀφθαλμοὺς μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος: no combination of words could more graphically represent their abominable lewdness; beautiful married women take complete possession of their eyes, and nothing in this world delights them more than to *insnare* the fickle-minded and wavering ones who forsake the guides of their youth, and the covenant made in the sight of God. Nor are they satisfied with once committing this heinous transgression, but cease not from sin in this particular. The seduction of youthful virgins is not enough to gratify their shameful appetites, but wives also must be caught and entangled in their snares, (18, 19 vs;) and this by men who call themselves teachers of Christianity! 1, 2 vs. Well does the apostle compare such to “irrational sensual animals;” and when “the Lord has come and shed light on the hidden things of darkness,” (the secret concealed sins of teachers or ministers now often covered with a dark veil,) “and manifested” (or brought to light) “the counsels of their hearts,” or motives of their actions as teachers, (1 Cor. 14: 5,) then these false teachers here described shall find, that their last state is destruction, Phil. 3: 19. Compare 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10; Prov. 2: 16–19; Prov. 5th chap. 6: 23–32; 7: 24–27. “Whose condemnation is just.”

The common version, “that cannot cease from sin” is, in our judgment, inaccurate. Our translators evidently supposed the verbal adjective, ἀταπαυστος to be passive, ‘not to be stopped,’ or ‘which cannot be made to cease;’ but it is the verbal adjective of the middle voice,* and hence the sense is, ‘Eyes that do not let themselves stop from sin,’ or ‘that cease not from the sin named.’ Their lascivious temper manifests itself by incessant wanton glances. Comp. Job 31: 1; Matt. 5: 27–29. The simple

*See Buttmann's Gr. by Robinson, § 136: 3.

verb, in the middle voice, is used in the first epistle, (4: 1,) "*Hath ceased from sin,*" *πᾶντα** *ἀμαρτίας*. *Souls*=persons, as in 1 Pet. 1: 11; 3: 20. *Insuaring*, enticing, *ἁλῶντες*, *taking with a bait*, as fishes with a hook, (Jas. 1: 14,) or land animals with a trap or snare, Xen. Mem. 2: 1, 4. The arts of these clerical hypocrites are thus designated, and hence it is equivalent to seducing. *Unestablished* souls=fickle-minded women, not stable or steadfast in their confession of Christ. Comp. 1: 12; 3: 16, 17, and 1 Pet. 5: 10. *How* they seduce such unsteady persons is described, 18, 19 vs. Compare 2 Tim. 3: 4-6.

Since they have a heart trained in covetousness—children of Curse! To be trained is to be drilled like soldiers, or like the *athletæ*, when about to strive in the games of victory, *γεγυμνασμένοι*. Their affections are so under their control that they easily direct them towards and fasten them on—money! their mental powers also are well disciplined, and they are skilful in the use of them; but then their skill is exerted mainly to hoard up for themselves; *trained in respect to covetousness*, or in reference to covetousness. Such men, like the Pharisees, devour widow's houses, and for a pretence make long prayers, and hence they shall justly receive greater condemnation, Matt. 23: 13. Compare 1 Tim. 6: 9, 10.

Children of Curse! an elliptical metaphor equivalent to, These are children of curse: 'appointed or doomed to punishment because of sin;' which is the same as saying, "In consequence of their corruption they shall be destroyed, receiving the wages of unrighteousness;" for since it is perfectly just and right with God to punish such sinners as are described in this context, how can it be wrong for him to determine to do it? The *curse* means the penalty threatened in the law of God, (Gal. 3: 10,) and to be children of that penalty, means to deserve such punishment; and consequently, since God is truthful and just, appointed to endure it. Compare 1 Pet. 2: 8. Thus Matt. 23: 16: "Ye make him twofold more *the child of hell* than yourselves." Our Lord also

calls Judas Iscariot, the avaricious traitor and hypocrite, "*the son of perdition*," John 17: 12 or, 'child of destruction.' And Peter tells Simon Magus, "Thy money perish with thee;" literally, "Thy money be with thee for destruction." Comp. 1 Sam. 20: 31; (Heb.) 1 Pet. 1: 4, with 2. *Doomed men!* therefore expresses the thought. Bengel: *children of curse*, "not of blessing in Christ," 1 Pet. 3: 9. Robinson: *κατάρας τέτνα*, *i. e.* "on whom the curse abides." Compare John 3: 36; Gal. 3: 10. Calvin: "*Cursed children* may be explained actively or passively; that is, they are persons who bring a curse with them wherever they come, or they are those who deserve the curse." This Hebraism, son or child of a thing, is very naturally used to express inseparable connection, or most intimate relation; such as that existing between parents and children. Children of Curses, signify those whose sins unite them *parentally*, with Perdition; or persons who have as an inseparable connection with the penalty denounced in God's law, as a child has with its mother: or, those who deserve to be punished, and accordingly are appointed thereunto. Compare 1 Thess. 5: 9; Eph. 2: 3.

V. 15. *Because they have forsaken the right way, wandered, and followed the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness.* Balaam is called the Son of Beor, Num. 22: 5; 24: 3; Mic. 6: 5. He was of Aram; of the city or town, Pethor, Num. 22: 5; 23: 7. The Aram meant, is Aram Naharim, (Aram of the two rivers) or the northern part of Mesopotamia. Num. 23: 7, with Deut. 23: 4. Lightfoot says that Bosor is the Chaldee way of writing Beor. (See Ainsworth on Num. 22: 5.) But this matter is of trifling importance, since all know that proper names when transferred from one language to another, are peculiarly liable to changes, both in vowels and consonants, in order to facilitate the pronunciation: *e. g.* Isaiah=Esaias.

Children of curse! because genuine successors of Balaam.

Balaam may have been fond of honor, (Num. 22: 17,) but it is beyond a doubt that he was *a money-lover*.

"The rewards of divination" in the hands of the elders or princes, 'the wages of unrighteousness,' (here literally used by the apostle,) were the things on which his heart was set. These *he loved*, Num. 22: 7. And his solemn declaration to the contrary, (18 v.) was feigned. He was indeed a miser, yet he would not, of course, acknowledge the fact to others, much less to the ambassadors who visited him. Neither would he have gone with them, after the Lord had expressly forbidden it, if he had not been exceedingly covetous, Num. 22: 13, 22, 32. Nor would he have afterwards given Balak the infamous council he did, viz: to entice Israel to idolatry and lewdness, if the love of money had not been his master-passion. Num. 31: 15, 16, and 25: 1-9; Rev. 2: 14. Those then, who knowingly pervert the gospel of the grace of God unto lasciviousness and idolatry, and that because of avarice, are imitators of Balaam, and shall be destroyed in consequence of their corruption.

To forsake the right way, is voluntarily to abandon truth and holiness; *to wander*, or go astray from it, is knowingly to embrace and propagate error and encourage one's self and others in a course of sin; or to "increase unto more ungodliness," 2 Tim. 2: 16; *to follow the way of Balaam*, is to imitate his conduct as a teacher, or to make use of the same abominable stratagem to gain one's ends as Balaam did to obtain his; in a word, to become virtually teachers of idolatry and uncleanness for filthy lucre's sake. These phrases contain the rhetorical figure, called by David N. Lord, hypocatastasis or substitution; by which *an act* with its object or condition is put, without a formal notice, for another analogous to it; either for illustration or ornament, or for both purposes.

The character of Balaam, as a man, is indefensible; he and Judas Iscariot certainly were not saints, else it would be compatible to serve both God and mammon, Matt. 6: 24. But what

must we think of him as a *prophet*? We reply that a wicked man may, for a time, be under the control of the Holy Spirit, and therefore truly prophesy, Matt. 7: 22. 1 Cor. 13: 3; and Moses, himself an undoubted prophet as well as lawgiver, by putting some of Balaam's prophecies in the Pentateuch, has thus given his testimony to the inspiration of those which he has recorded. So far Balaam must be held as a prophet, though a bad man. While uttering those prophecies which Moses has preserved, He who made his soul had the perfect mastery of it, so that Balaam involuntarily blessed those whom he came to curse; but this was a rare thing in his life, for his usual course was to resort to enchantments and use divination, Num. 22: 7; 23: 20, 23; 24: 1. Accordingly he is called, in reference to his uniform doings, the soothsayer or diviner, Josh. 13: 22; an expression applied to false prophets. Dent. 18: 10, 14; Mic. 3: 6, 7, 11; 2 Ki. 17: 17. 1 Sam. 6: 2. (See Butler's Sermon on the character of Balaam.)

V. 16. *But he had a refutation of his transgression, when the dumb ass spoke in a voice like men, and restrained the prophet's madness.* *Refutation*, ἐλεγχέν = ἐλεγχος, conviction: or such are proof of a person's error, theoretical or practical, as causes shame, and leaves him without excuse. 2 Tim. 3: 16. Job. 21: 4; 23: 2. LXX. He was thus confuted or reproved by the utterance of the ass on which he rode. An ass is by nature *dumb* or speechless, ἄφωνος; and when it spoke in a voice like that of men, "Jehovah opened its mouth," Num. 22: 28. An adequate cause is thus assigned for the effect wrought; and if men can teach a parrot to hold quite a clever dialogue with them, surely it was not too hard for Jehovah to enable an ass to hold such a dialogue with Balaam. And pray, what was the brute herein but an unconscious and passive instrument of God's power? And the prophet showed what an insane sinner he was, in not regarding the divine monition thus conveyed to him. (The miraculously incorrigible ignorance on Scriptural topics, often

shown by skeptical gentlemen, shows that the “*pons asinorum*” may be found not only in Euclid, but elsewhere.)

The apostle uses the aorist tenses, ἔσχεν and ἐξώλεσε, to intimate that the refutation of Balaam’s transgression, or the remorse and shame he felt, as well as the restraint or hindrance to which he was subjected, were but momentary: his covetousness, as the master-passion, soon administered an opiate to his conscience, strengthening him for the Devil’s service. And false teachers imitate him in this particular. (“Forbade,” in the common version, means ‘restrained’ or ‘hindered.’)

The aorist participle, φθιγγίζόμενον, = ‘suddenly and unexpectedly uttered,’ is used to suggest that the miraculous effect, wrought by the Divine power, was but for a moment; the animal immediately after relapsing into its speechless state, or natural condition. With or *in a voice like men*, ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ = ‘in a man’s voice,’ *Mudness*: to persevere in known rebellion to God because of fleeting riches, is indeed an indisputable proof of an insane heart and a perverted will; παραφροσύνη = παραφροσύνη.

¹⁷These are wells without water, clouds by a tempest driven; for whom the blackness of everlasting darkness is kept. ¹⁸For by uttering great swelling words of vanity, in consequence of carnal lusts, they insnare with lascivious arts those who had for a little while fled from them who walk in error; [and,] ¹⁹by promising them freedom, while they themselves are the slaves of corruption! for by what any one is overcome, to that is he also enslaved. ²⁰For if after they have fled from the defilements of the world in acknowledging the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled by these and overcome, [then] their last state becomes worse than the first: ²¹better, indeed, had it been for them not to have acknowledged the way of righteousness, than after they have acknowledged it, to turn away from the holy commandment delivered to them. ²²But that which is signified by the true proverb has overtaken them: The dog has gone back to his own vomit; and, the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire.

V. 17. *These are wells without water*: by this metaphor the apostle happily indicates that in some respects the false teachers are plausible; they make a great show of utility, but after all

they are worthless. When a thirsty and tired traveller perceives a well not far off, or notices the indications of a fountain, he naturally rejoices; but if, on a nearer approach, he finds only the outward apparatus of a well, but not a drop of water in it, or if the spring is dried up, his disappointment is great and painful. And when men are at all ingenuous and truth-loving, they naturally expect that professed teachers of Christianity will tell them the truth; but how great and poignant must be the disappointment of such, in many instances! The apostle, however, here warns us that these false teachers are ostentatious hypocrites, and that it is foolish for men to expect any true instruction from them. ‘These false teachers are specious deceivers; they disappoint the natural expectations of those who depend on them for religious instruction.’ They are wells *without water*, destitute of holiness and truth; with both of which, however, the apostles have been supplied by Jesus our Lord, 1: 3, 4.

Clouds by a tempest driven: or, clouds storm-driven, *i. e.* *clouds under the control of the stormy winds*. (Compare the original in Mark 4: 37; Luke 8: 23.) This metaphor is generally explained as intended to express their fickleness in doctrinal tenets, or their specious uselessness to their disciples, or both combined; or as designed to describe the harm they do their followers. For example, Calvin: “As soon as dark clouds appear men expect rain to water the earth, He says that they are *clouds scattered by the wind*, bringing no rain, but bursting forth into a calamitous storm; or that they never bring anything useful, but often very hurtful.” Bloomfield: “Specious but deceiving, as wells destitute of water, and clouds which bring no rain.” Benson translates, “Light clouds, driven by a tempestuous wind,” and he agrees in substance with Calvin’s explanation, but he adds: “In this comparion” (he should have said, metaphor) “the apostle might possibly intend to denote their levity and inconstancy, as well as their hypocrisy—they were carried about with every wind of doctrine.”

These interpretations are plausible, but objectionable ; for thus a *tautology* is introduced, which should never be done without necessity : “Wells without water,” and “clouds by a tempest driven,” express thus precisely the same thing. The modes of explanation above exhibited are liable to another grave objection, viz: *they are not interpretations of Peter’s word at all, but only of Jude’s*, who has “Clouds without water ;” *i. e.*, they are *specious but useless as teachers*, like waterless clouds which add nothing to the earth’s fertility. But *this thought* PETER expresses by “Wells without water.” And that Jude does not confine himself to Peter’s expressions in his description of the false teachers, is certain : “These are breakers in your love-feasts, feeding themselves while feasting fearlessly with you ; *clouds without water borne on by winds* ; trees leafless, unfruitful, twice-dead, uprooted ; wild waves of the sea foaming up their own indecencies ; wandering stars, *for whom the blackness of everlasting darkness is kept.*” 12, 13 vs. We are not satisfied, therefore, with the ordinary explanations, and chiefly because they are *not* expositions of the clause before us ; for Peter does *not* say, “Clouds without water,” but “Clouds.”

As already said, “*Clouds by a tempest driven*” mean clouds under the control of the stormy wind ; and the metaphor, in our judgment, must be thus explained : ‘These false teachers are weak and helpless persons, as unable to escape the tempest of the Divine indignation as clouds to resist the force of the stormy wind.’ Or, ‘As clouds are under the control of a tempest, so are these in the hands of the Judge. Their inevitable destruction is thus set forth in the clearest manner.

For whom the blackness of everlasting darkness is kept. “Blackness of darkness”=the thickest or most dense darkness : ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους. (See Iliad 15 : 191 ; Odys. 21 : 57.) It denotes the severest punishment, or a most miserable state of anguish. ‘These false teachers are persons for whom the severest punishment is reserved.’ Sometimes the future condition of the

lost is figuratively represented by "fire," sometimes by "darkness;" Matt. 25 : 30, 41; explained by Christ, as meaning "punishment," Matt. 25 : 46. There is a metonymy and a metaphor mingled or combined in the expression, *The Gloom of Darkness*, or *the blackness of darkness*. The metaphor has been already explained to mean the severest misery, caused by sin; (see on 4th verse,) a state in which there is no light or gladness, (Ps. 97 : 11,) but dense darkness or sorrow only, unmixed with joy. "The blackness of darkness" is put, by metonymy, for the place where such darkness reigns; the allusion being to Tartarus, or Hell, mentioned in the fourth verse. Thus, in substance, Benson and Bloomfield interpret, but without analysing the figures. That there is such a metonymy in the expression, is evident from the verb "is kept," *τετηρηται*. "The prison in which there is the thickest darkness is reserved for these false teachers; or it is secured, safely kept for such." (Compare *τετηρημενοι*, 1 Pet. 1 : 4. See also Jude, 6 v.)

"*The blackness of darkness for ever is kept*" = the blackness of *everlasting* darkness: *εις αιωνα* to eternity, for ever, or everlasting. (Compare what we have said on 13 v.) The Creator and Judge of fallen men and angels will not annihilate any soul or spirit, and the moral corruption of the lost cannot, from the very nature of the thing, be improved in a place and state of unspeakable anguish: "in their corruption they shall be destroyed, receiving the wages of unrighteousness," 12, 13 vs. Besides, God has nowhere promised regeneration or restoration to the lost in hell. On the contrary, we are expressly told that it will be "everlasting punishment:" lasting as long as the immortal soul and indestructible body endure: lasting for ever from the epoch of Christ's coming as Judge, Mark 9 : 48, 49; Matt. 10 : 28; 25 : 46, with 31 v.; 2 Thess. 1 : 9. And they are false teachers, who deny it.

The sense of this verse then, may be thus expressed: 'These men are wells without water, or ostentatious hypocrites, destitute

of the true knowledge of the gospel and the holiness which it requires, but they must not expect to escape from the hands of the Almighty and just Judge any more than clouds can resist the force of a tempest; and indeed all such expectations are vain, since hell, a place and state of the most dreadful punishment, is prepared for them, where they will for ever suffer, as their sins deserve.'

A. B. C. have *καὶ ομίχλαι*, "and mists;" but this does not materially change the thought, for they are as much under the control of a tempest as "clouds;" which last word, *νεφελαι*, is found in G. and Syriac version. The word found in the Vulgate, *Nebulae*, is ambiguous; for although it literally means 'mists,' yet it is used by Latin poets in the sense of 'clouds.' *Εἰς αἰῶνα* is omitted by B. the Vulgate, and Syriac version; but these words (*for ever*, or *everlasting*) are found in A. C. G. Tischendorf and Lachmann, therefore had no right to expel them from the text. Griesbach, Bloomfield and Hahn retain them. Besides, they all agree in editing them, Jude, 13 v.

It thus appears, that the external evidence is by no means sufficient to prove that these words are interpolated; and their genuineness is further confirmed by internal evidence. The apostle is by no means incoherent and confused in his description of the false teachers, as Davidson and others assume. On the contrary, as appears from the exposition given of the preceding portion of this chapter, he is unquestionably coherent and perspicuous. The first three verses form what may be called, the text of his prophetic discourse; or they contain the main propositions of which he, in the rest of the chapter, speaks more copiously. The characteristics of the false teachers as deniers of the sovereignty of their professed Redeemer; their lasciviousness and covetousness, with their success in gaining disciples and imitators, and the swiftness and certainty of the punishment of both, as well as its justice, (*"bringing on themselves swift destruction,"*) are all briefly stated in these verses. (Their contempt of govern-

ment and reviling of dignities is the only characteristic feature not mentioned in 1-3 vs., but in 10 v.) From the fourth to the end of the first part of the tenth verse, the apostle proves the *certainty* of the punishment of the unrighteous and especially of their false teachers, when the judge shall have come, and the certainty of the deliverance of the pious from a state of trial at the same great day. Then to the seventeenth verse, he gives *a more particular description* of these false teachers, *repeating*, as he proceeds, the *certainty* of their punishment and illustrating its *justice*. Some of these "blind guides," he tells us, shall be distinguished as insolent and fool-hardy anarchists; others, as clerical epicureans; others, as in fact teachers and workers of lasciviousness under saintly masks; others, as covetous imitators of Balaam, and, that all of them deserve the punishment to which they are doomed because of their heinous transgressions, 10-16 vs. The apostle therefore, does not wander from his prophetic text, but clearly proves and illustrates it. Now, to assume that *εἰς αἰῶνα* is interpolated, is at the same time to take for granted that 18-22 vs. contain nothing but what has been already copiously stated and illustrated: it is to make the apostle tautological, simply because *we* do not happen to understand his scope in these concluding verses; which certainly is no proof of skill and accuracy in biblical criticism. The aim of the apostle in this concluding portion of his prophetic discourse is, *to show the justice of the everlasting duration* of the punishment of false teachers and their followers. Their punishment will not only be certain, but inevitable when Christ comes; not only just, but *everlasting*: and such punishment is richly deserved.

V. 18. *For by uttering great swelling words of vanity, in consequence of carnal lusts, they ensnare with lascivious arts those who had for a little while fled from them who walk in error.* The apostle, as just said, is showing the justice of the *everlasting* punishment of false teachers. Everlasting misery in hell is reserved for such, *first*, because they are *præeminent hypocrites*,

making great professions of truth and holiness while in fact destitute of both; or because they are wells without water, and know it, while pretending to be filled to the brim, 17 v. *Secondly*, endless misery is reserved for them, because, *by promulgating known falsehood and by promising impunity, they tempt and lead to licentiousness and apostasy* those professors who had fled for a time from the gross wickedness of their former associates, 18, 19 vs. *Thirdly*, because by thus *turning their backs on the known requirements of the gospel*, and enticing others to do the same, they bring themselves and those whom they had led astray *into an incurable state and habit of moral corruption*, worse than that before their profession; thus preparing themselves and others for “everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power,” 22–22 vs.

But uttering great swelling words of vanity: ὑπέροχα ματαιό-
τητος, literally, “*over-bulky words of vanity.*” Compare LXX. Dan. 11: 36; Jude, 16 v. Thus their inflated expressions or bombastic style is denoted, as well as their magisterial air; uttering ore rotundo,

“Words of learned length and thundering sound,
To make the gaping rustics stare around.”

Horace: Projicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba. It is always ridiculous pride that impels any speaker or writer to adopt such a style; and when a professed teacher of Christianity makes it his own, it is a sure indication of arrogance towards men, and irreverence towards God. To “play such paltry tricks before high heaven,” can demonstrate only the sin and folly of the performers. Besides, these “great swelling words,” are defined as to their subject-matter by the genitive following: great swelling words *of vanity*, ματαιότητος. The word rendered vanity means literally *emptiness, idleness*, and hence denotes any thing that is unprofitable, or useless for good. In Eph. 4: 17, the same noun is used: “As the rest of the Gentiles walk, *in the vanity of their mind*, darkened as to the understanding, being alienated from

the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them on account of the hardness of their hearts ; who being past feeling," etc., 18, 19, 20 vs. Here Paul defines the vanity or emptiness spoken of as pertaining to the mind, and then states that their mind is empty, or useless for good, inasmuch as their understanding is darkened with respect to the true way of salvation, and their hearts estranged from the holiness required by God ; and, moreover, that their ignorance of truth is caused by their love of sin. Paul and Peter then agree in this, that men are wells without water, when destitute of holiness and truth—this is that vanity which is peculiar to unrenewed men, 1 Cor. 3 : 20. "The Lord knows the thoughts (or reasonings) of the wise," (those who falsely claim to be philosophers or scientific theologians,) "that they are *vain* ;" which must mean that they are *false*, or truthless, Rom. 1 : 21. "Because when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but *became vain in their reasonings*," etc., *i. e.*, "found no end in wandering mazes lost ;" because they did not adhere to the truth they knew, their minds became so perverted and foolish as to embrace falsehood or error.

Great swelling words of vanity, then mean high-sounding inflated expressions conveying *falsehood*, or *erroneous doctrines pompously uttered*. Vanity also, by implication means wickedness ; for to speak known falsehood or error is sin, and especially when done to entice professors to licentiousness and apostacy.

The blackness of darkness for ever is kept for these false teachers, *for they insnare those who had for a little while fled from them that walk in error ; i. e.*, because they entice and lead to apostacy those persons who for a time acknowledged Christ, and so escaped from their former associates who live in falsehood and sin. But *how* do they thus tempt or insnare them ? "*By speaking great swelling words of vanity ; by promising them freedom ;*" (19 v.,) and *by those lascivious arts* in which they are adepts. (The verb "insnare," entice or seduce, expresses the

action attributed to the false teachers; the participles, “uttering” and “promising,” with the noun in the dative, indicate the manner in which it is effected.) *Why* do they *succeed* in their temptations? “*In consequence of carnal lusts,*” or because of the bodily appetites prevailing in the unsteady persons they entice. Compare 14 v.; 2 Tim. 3: 6. We punctuate thus: δελεάζουσιν, ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκος, ἀσελγείαις τοῦτ' ὀλίγως—: which we think more perspicuous and accurate than to make ἀσελγείαις in apposition with the phrase immediately preceding, as is done by our translators. The plural, ἀσελγείαις, is used to denote their various stratagems, or the lascivious methods used in insnaring unestablished souls. The adverb ὀλίγως= is equivalent to ὀλίγον, (1 Pet. 5: 10,) *a little while*; where it is contrasted with αἰώνιον, ‘everlasting.’ Compare 1 Pet. 1: 6. ‘But a little,’ in a slight degree, not yet fully, as others explain, seems not to be correct; for, as Bengel justly remarks, “the compound verb ἀποφεύγετε (without οὐτως) denotes those who truly escape,” 20 v., 1, 4.

ὀλίγως, A. B. Vulgate, and Syriac version: Jerome, Augustine, Bede. (Four manuscripts have ολίγον.) ὁπτως, C. G. K. Theoplyact, Œcumenius. But the remark just made concerning ἀποφεύγετε shows that the various readings make no difference whatever in the sense.

V. 19. [And] *by promising them freedom*: this clause must be connected with the preceding verse. They insnare or seduce by uttering great swelling words of vanity, and they insnare by promising them freedom. These false teachers, while laying their baits to insnare unestablished souls, promise freedom to them indirectly, and directly. They, in high-flying words of error and wickedness, intimate that freedom consists in living as one pleases; in gratifying to the full any natural desire or appetite; but hinting that truth and error, sin and holiness, the devil and his temptations, are all dreams or pure imaginations of superstitious men; and when these poisoned baits are taken, or some of them, then they directly assert that Hell exists only in the fancy

of melancholy men ; thus making God a liar. Some Pantheistic wretches in all ages have gone still farther, and blasphemously asserted that, since God himself works all in all, to commit sin is impossible. As if God were not Light, but Darkness ; as if God himself were the only sinner ! *Freedom from everlasting punishment in hell*, is what false teachers assert ; and hence full permission exists, for living as one's lusts dictate when on earth. "These are clouds by a tempest driven, for whom the gloom of everlasting darkness is kept."

Calvin's treatise written against the "Spiritual Libertines" of his day, is the best exposition of this verse. They called themselves "Spiritual Freedmen," in the sense before explained. They were gross Pantheists, exceedingly immoral, and made sin and the devil the subjects of their witticisms : their doctrinal tenets may be briefly defined by this expression, Pantheistic Universalists. They had "the bad eminence" of being justly styled "Free-Livers" and "Free-Lovers." And, amid the boasted light of this century, false teachers have arisen who, to make men easy in their sins, assert universal salvation ; some, even by calling "spirits from the vasty deep" to insnare unestablished souls. Necromancy was fashionable with many in the time of Moses, and is not yet, it seems, out of date ; but when men, or so-called disembodied spirits dare to give the lie to the Holy Scriptures, they show that "they are of their father the devil."

"Freedom to them promising, *while they themselves are the slaves of corruption!*" How preposterous for those enslaved by divers lusts, some of them bestial, to talk about Freedom, in any true sense of that much-abused word ! How can they who teach the ethics of Hell, and who wallow in lust, as swine in mire, be accredited servants of the Holy One ? Such promised freedom—what will it end in, but everlasting bondage to sin and woe ? Compare John 8 : 34 ; Rom. 6 : 16. If we are overpowered by our evil passions here, we become their slaves ; and when men "die in their sins," their captivity to their evil passions is everlasting.

V. 20. *For if after they have fled from the defilements of the world in acknowledging the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled by these and overcome, [then] their last state becomes worse than the first.* From this verse to the end of the chapter the apostle shows that the false teachers will be everlastingly punished, because by disregarding the known holy requirements of the gospel, and enticing others to do the same, they bring themselves and their followers into an incurable state and habit of moral corruption; thus preparing themselves and others for endless misery. Compare Rom. 9: 22.

The false teachers and their followers once *acknowledged the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; that is, they acknowledged him to be not only the Saviour, but the Lord, whose precepts they were bound to obey. By so doing they demonstrated that their consciences had been awakened to a sense of the danger of their way of living; and they accordingly abandoned their gross open transgressions, or *fled from them* with great and unfeigned dread, as they would have done from persons or garments defiled with some contagious disease. But they were *again entangled and overcome* by these polluting and destructive sins. The consequence of which apostacy is, that *their last state becomes worse than the first*; or, they become more depraved and hardened than before their profession of the faith. (The apostle here omits the sign of the apostasy; it must be supplied in the manner mentioned on 4 v.) This apostacy is also worse because their love of polluting sins is then generally incurable, (compare Heb. 6: 4-6, and 10, 26-31,) and their future punishment more severe and awful.

Our apostle has before shown that a confession of Christ must be followed, not simply by a temporary abstinence from these pollutions, but by becoming God-like in knowledge and holiness; or, by constantly advancing in the cultivation of boldness, faith, in the knowledge of the gospel and prudence, self-government, perseverance and patience, piety towards God, love to the breth-

ren, and benevolence practically shown to men. And he declares that if any professor is destitute of these virtues, his confession is hypocritical or insincere. 1: 4-9. Now, when a saint or renewed person is garrisoned in God's power, through faith, for that salvation which is ready to be revealed when Christ comes again, 1 Pet. 1: 3-5; this faith works in the manner which the apostle describes in 2 Pet. 1: 5-7. All other professors are hypocritical — "blind eye-shutters," 1: 9. Whitby and Benson therefore might have spared their remarks in opposition to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. Our apostle certainly teaches this doctrine, but he teaches it so that it can never be honestly perverted to any sinful purposes. 1 Pet. 1: 4; 2 Pet. 1: 5-10. He means by it the perseverance or steadfast continuance of the saints in holiness; constant growth in the same: faith being the instrumental cause of this growth, and God's power, manifested by the indwelling operations of the Good Spirit, the efficient cause of such perseverance. Col. 3: 3; Phil. 1: 19; Eph. 3: 16, 20. And the doctrine as taught in the creeds of the Reformed Church differs in no respect from that of the apostle. On the other hand, Peter teaches in this chapter that the perseverance of sinners in error and sin will lead to everlasting destruction.

The defilements of the world, or the crimes which especially defile mankind, are idolatry, covetousness, drunkenness and uncleanness. Peter here especially alludes to the latter. Compare 1 Pet. 4: 3; 2 Pet. 2: 2; 5: 10; 13-15, 18; 2 Pet. 1: 4. Compare *LXX.* Gen. 34: 13; 49: 4; Job. 31: 11. Benson: "*Miasma* was used by the ancient physicians for the pestilential infection of the plague, which spreads insensibly and infects many." Peter thus describes the sins of the flesh in a very striking manner, viz.: "the miasmata of the world." And Paley justly says: "However it be accounted for, the criminal commerce of the sexes corrupts and depraves the mind and moral character more than any single species of vice whatsoever. That ready preception

of guilt, that prompt and decisive resolution against it, which constitutes a virtuous character, is seldom found in persons addicted to these indulgencies. They prepare an easy admission for every sin that seeks it; are in low life, usually the first stage in men's progress to the most desperate villainies; and in high life, to that lamented dissoluteness of principle, which manifests itself in a profligacy of public conduct, and a contempt of the obligations of religion and moral probity."

V. 21. *Better, indeed, had it been for them not to have acknowledged the way of righteousness, than, after they have acknowledged it, to turn away from the holy commandment delivered to them.*

Better, indeed, etc. $\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\tau\omega\zeta \gamma\alpha\rho$; or, "for it had been better," etc. This verse gives the reason why the last state of those who apostatize and return to their former defilements is worse than the first. First, *because they sin against greater light or knowledge*, and thus manifest a more incorrigible temper than before their confession. When "*they acknowledged the way of righteousness*," their understanding and conscience were in some degree aroused; they assented to the excellency and reasonableness of that holy way; and they made a public declaration of their belief in the divine origin of Christianity, expressing at the same time, a willingness to make its holy precepts the rule of their life, as well as its promises the basis of their anticipations of present peace and future bliss. To return to their old filthy sins after such a knowledge and confession, was a crime indeed. Secondly, because by thus turning their backs on the command requiring holiness, they manifested greater irreverence towards God, ingratitude to Christ for light received as to the way of salvation; and an insatiable liking to the vilest sins—thus "doing despite to the spirit of grace." Such will justly receive most severe and everlasting punishment inasmuch as they are persons who, with both eyes open and from a pure love of sinning, perseveringly and shamelessly rebel against God, Heb. 10: 29; Luke 12: 47.

Επιστρέχει ἐξ=to turn away from, turn the back upon; G. K.: *απο*, A., but for *εξ*, B. C. G. K.; *εἰς τὰ οπίσω υποστρέφαι* was probably a marginal explanation, A. Vulgate. (Tischendorf adopts the common text; Lachmann, the reading last mentioned.)

V. 22. *But that which is signified by the true proverb has overtaken them: The dog has gone back to his own vomit; and, the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire.*

That which is signified by the true proverb, τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας, literally, “the of the true proverb;” it is the article demonstrative, equivalent to “that of the true proverb,” or that which is meant by it, the thing of which the proverb is a true description. That which is intended by the proverb is true in their case; or it *has overtaken them*, or *met with them*, συμβέβηκε δὲ αὐτοῖς. By which is meant, not simply that “it has happened to them,” but that it has befallen them as a calamity or punishment. (Compare 1 Pet. 4: 12. “As if something strange were overtaking you,” *i. e.*, as if some strange punishment had started, and was on the way to meet you, ὥς ξένου ὅμων συμβαίνοντος.) The persecution to which believers were exposed is called by Peter, in his first epistle, “the judgment,” τὸ κρίμα, or punishment allotted to them in this world, under the controlling providence of God, for their sins, 1 Pet. 4: 17. “Because it is the season of the beginning of the judgment from the house of God,” the appointed and fit time for a punishment like this to be inflicted first of all on God’s family; “but if first from us, what shall be the end of them who disobey the gospel of God?” What, their final condition, who rebel against the gospel? If then we were to supply thus, τὸ [κρίμα] τῇς, etc., it would not be repugnant to the apostle’s style and mode of thinking: “But the [judgment] signified by the true proverb has met with them;” that is, the punishment to which God often abandons vile sinners in this world has overtaken them, (comp. 2: 3,) they are joined to their sins as idols, and their punishment in this world, after their apostacy, consists in this judicial abandonment, or in being left to themselves “to

work uncleanness with greediness." See Henderson on Hos. 4: 17, and compare Ezek. 20: 39; Rom. 1: 24-28. When men are thus left to themselves, they become more and more corrupt, and ripe for everlasting punishment, and so their last state is worse than their first.

The dog has gone back to his own vomit: *κύων*, the article is omitted, because the style of proverbs is emphatically concise and compacted. (The poetical and prophetic style has the same peculiarity. See 2: 9; 3: 7; *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως*.) Peter alludes to Prov. 26: 11, according to the Hebrews, "A fool repeating in his folly," (repeating and persisting in it) "is like the dog that goes back" [to feed] "upon his vomit." And so the apostle: "The dog has gone back" [to feed] "upon his own vomit," *ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέπραμα*: this last word is a rare one, though the cognate verb is used by the ancient physicians. (Benson and T. Smith.) Peter cites from the Proverbs of Solomon, (1 Pet. 4: 8,) (and 4: 18, acc. to *LXX*.) The other proverb, "the washed sow" [has gone back] "to her wallowing in the mire," was probably one in common use: and the apostle employs both to intimate that he refers both to the false teachers and their dupes, or to the seducers and the seduced. 'As the dog returns to his vomit and the sow to her filthy wallowing, so these, to their old sins or former polluting vices.' Impenitent and shameless sinners with their leaders in the Satanic school, are here denoted by dogs and swine; not men that were once truly renewed. Compare Isa. 56: 10-12; Matt. 7: 6; Phil. 3: 2; Rev. 22: 15; Deut. 23: 18.

Thus the apostle, in this chapter, has foretold the rise and continuance of false teachers in the Christian church down to Christ's second coming, just as false prophets appeared in the Jewish church until his first advent: he has graphically portrayed their characteristics, predicted their success, the certainty of their punishment, together with their disciples and imitators; he has proved and illustrated its justice and its everlasting duration: and he has also declared that the righteous will be de-

livered from trial ; and that these things shall occur at the day of judgment, or when Christ has come the second time to our world as Judge.

In favor of *συνεξηγουν αυτοις* are A. B. : but C. G. K. have in addition, *δε : κλησμον,* B. C.* *κλησμου* A. G. K.

CHAPTER III.

¹Beloved, this is already the second epistle I am writing to you, in both of which I awaken by admonition your pure mind, ²in order that ye may be reminded of the things foretold by the holy prophets and the commandment of your apostles of the Lord and Saviour; ³knowing this first, that there shall come in the last of the days scoffers with scoffing, walking according to their own lusts, ⁴and saying: 'Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue precisely as from the beginning of creation.' ⁵For this they are willingly ignorant of, that the heavens were of old and the earth of water and by water constituted by the word of God; ⁶whereby (or, by which) the then world, deluged with water, was destroyed. ⁷But the new heavens and earth by his word are stored up, kept for fire at the day of judgment and perdition of these ungodly men. ⁸But beloved, be not ye ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. ⁹The promised Lord delays not, as some think it a delay; but is longsuffering towards you, not willing that any be destroyed, but that all come to repentance.

Some suppose that the scoffers whose appearance is here foretold, do not differ from the false teachers depicted in the preceding chapter; or, if they do, it is only in the habitual sneering manner in which they deny our Lord's coming as The Judge. But this, in our judgment, is a mistaken opinion; for the false teachers are represented as acknowledging Christ to be their Redeemer, but denying him to be Lord or Sovereign; denying his second coming *as Judge of the wicked*, but asserting that he will come to save all men without exception and without distinction. Whereas *the scoffers deny his coming altogether*, pronounce it a mere fable, and ridicule it as such. The transition from the pulpit of the false teacher to the chair of the scorner is indeed easy, and many have gone and still go from one to the other; nevertheless the heretical pulpit and the scorner's chair are not precisely the same. The apostle predicts here the rise of infidels, skeptics, or deists; and many such have been and are apostates, but not all;

the appearance, then, of infidels, whether arising within the visible church or outside of it, is here predicted.

V. 1. *Beloved, this is already the second epistle I am writing to you, in both of which I awaken by admonition your pure mind:* The position of ἤδη (now already,) seems to intimate that but a short time had elapsed since the writing of the first epistle, τὰς τε ἡμετέρας ἤδη, etc. "This is already the second letter which I am writing to you." You may think it very soon after the first was sent, but there is need of reminding you, etc., (2 v.) The apostles wrote comparatively little and seldom, but what they have written is like silver seven times purified; and of the highest authority, since they wrote as Christ's legates and by his Spirit. He therefore who despises their writings, flings contempt on the Master who appointed and qualified them for their work as infallible teachers of the way of life, 1: 3, 4; 1 Thess. 4: 8; 1 John 4: 6.

This second epistle: Here there is an allusion to 1 Pet. 5: 12. "Testifying that *this* [epistle] is the true Grace of God," or exhibits an outline of the genuine unadulterated gospel, agreeing with what Paul, and his assistants taught you. This is what Paley would call "an undesigned coincidence," one perfectly natural in the author of both epistles; a coincidence arising spontaneously, or without premeditation; and therefore, with others, a highly satisfactory proof of the authenticity of this letter.

In both of which, ἐν αἷς, (sc. ἐπιστολαῖς.) Bengel: Syllepsis, i. e., in qua, ut in priore, in which, as in the former. *I awaken by admonition your pure mind;* I excite your minds by powerful motives as to your duty; not supposing that you are ignorant of it, or that I will be unsuccessful, since your *mind* is *pure*: εἰληπτονῇ διάνοιαν, a mind or disposition examined by the sun's light; hence, a mind pure, tested, found genuine, uncontaminated, well-disposed or ingenuous. Bengel: *sinceram*, nullo errore adulteratam. Compare 1: 12, 13. As to διάνοια, in the sense here used, (see Eph. 2: 3; Col. 1: 21; and compare 1 Pet. 1: 13.)

The adjective *ἐλλειπενός* is used by Paul, (Phil. 1: 10,) and the kindred noun, (1 Cor. 5: 8; 2 Cor. 1: 12, and 2: 17.)

V. 2. *In order that ye may be reminded of the things foretold by the holy prophets, and the commandment of your apostles, of the Lord and Saviour.*

The things foretold by the holy prophets relates especially to Christ's first coming in a lowly state as Prophet and Priest, and to his second coming in power and glory as King and Judge. Schaff calls Peter "the apostle of hope," and rightly; because in his first epistle one important design is to animate believers under sorrows and persecutions by the great reward which they will obtain when their chief pastor or ruler has come; 1 Pet. 1: 5-11; 13 v. with 3: 7; 4: 12, 13; 5: 1; 4: 10. (Also, to show the doom of the ungodly and persecutors at the same great day, 4: 3-5; 17: 18.) Peter therefore, emphatically proclaims hope to the pious at Christ's advent—but destruction to the wicked. And this corresponds exactly with what we find in his second epistle; which is no flimsy proof of its genuineness. Prophets are called *holy*, because *consecrated to God's service* as his interpreters, as in 1: 21. *The things foretold by the holy prophets*, τῶν προφητῶν ῥημάτων, etc. To translate this, "*the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets*," is introducing a needless tautology; for ῥῆμα, like the Hebrew, Dabar, means *a thing*, (Luke 1: 37; 2: 15; Acts 5: 32,) where Peter is the speaker; and so it must be understood here, and in Jude, 17 v. *Things* must be foretold by written words, else they could not be foretold at all, words would be signs of certain sounds only.

And the commandment, etc.; by this expression Peter refers to 2: 21. Compare 1: 3-12. It is the command or precept of the apostles of Christ, demanding holiness as the proof of their faith in Jesus our Lord, or as a criterion of the sincerity of their professed faith in him; and as necessary to share in the employments and enjoyments of his everlasting kingdom. *Your apostles*, that is, apostles who have taught you the true gospel, 1 Pet. 5: 12. He refers

particularly to himself and his beloved brother Paul, (3 : 15;) for Paul taught the churches in Asia Minor both orally and by writing; Peter, by his pen only. They both treat of Christ's second coming with power as King and Judge, and both insist on the necessity of holiness for admission into his everlasting kingdom. Bengel mentions this interpretation thus: *Alii, τῶν ἀποστόλων ἑμῶν, inter vos hac ætate versantium; in antitheto ad prophetas veteres.*

Of the Lord and Saviour: τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος. It is the genitive of source or origin, equivalent to, 'Sent forth, (or commissioned,) by the Lord and Saviour.' These words should be connected with "prophets" as well as "apostles;" for both were commissioned by the Lord and Saviour: which is an undesigned coincidence with 1 Pet. 1: 10-12. The Spirit of Christ in the prophets foretold the complete salvation of the saints at our Lord's advent, and the apostles announced the same good news by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. (Comp. Acts 2: 33.) Accordingly the sense is: My design is to remind you of the things foretold by the prophets relative to our Lord's coming, and of the necessity of holiness in order to your admission into his kingdom, which Paul and myself, who have been your apostolical instructors, agree in pressing on your ingenuous minds.

To say, as Calvin does, that ἐπολή means the whole doctrine taught by the apostles, is forced and unnatural; for the word means precept, law requiring obedience.

A. B. C. G. K., almost fifty others, and Vulgate, have ἑμῶν: some cursive manuscripts have ἡμῶν. (Tischendorf.) We consider ἑμῶν as alone genuine: the MSS. evidence for it being overwhelming. Besides, τῶν ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν can only mean "our apostles;" which would imply that the writer did not reckon himself as one of the apostles: but a man even of the most torpid mind *could not*, in so brief a letter, *forget* what he had previously said. But there are no marks of forgery in this epistle, as we have proved in the

introduction. To justify the version in the English Bible the order should have been ἡμῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων, for which there is nothing that can be called evidence; so that Bengel's reference to Acts 10: 41, to prove an apposition, falls to the ground.

V. 3. *Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last of the days scoffers with scoffing, walking according to their own lusts.*

Knowing this first: Provided ye first know this, which I take for granted, as in 1: 20. The participle expresses a condition or supposition assumed as true. *First* in importance, especially. *This*, i. e., this fact, viz.: that there shall come, etc. *Scoffers*, ἐμπαῖται, or *scorners*. See LXX. Isa. 3: 4; Jude, 18 v. The noun is derived from ἐμπαίζω which means to bring a boy's disposition to bear on any matter, or to act like a boy in any thing; hence, to mock, scoff, sneer at or deride. Thus when the Roman soldiers gave way to such a disposition, they arrayed our Saviour in a crimson cloak, put a crown or wreath of plaited thorns on his head, a reed in his right hand, and, having bowed the knee before him, *mocked* him, saying, hail, King of the Jews, Matt. 27: 28, 29. (Compare Matt 27: 41 with 39 v., "They *reviled* him.") A scorner or scoffer, then, is one who treats the most serious and important matters as frivolously as a capricious boy; one who sneers at the coming of our Lord, and ridicules it as a fable. Such sophists "make ridicule the test of truth;" they love irony more than any other rhetorical figure of speech, and use it to dishonor God, and as an argument to show that man is a sort of—"dignified brute," returning at last to nonentity! *Scoffers with scoffing*, ἐν ἐμπαῖσιν, or, *in scoffing*, that is, persisting in scoffing; ἐν being used to intimate a constant course of action; as in 1 Pet. 4: 19, "*In* well doing." (In favor of this reading are A. B. C., Vulgate, Coptic and Syriac versions, G. K. omit it. Tischendorf.)

Walking according to their own lusts, i. e., making their own sinful inclinations and desires the rule of action, in opposition to the will of God as made known in the writings of prophets and

apostles, (2 v). Compare 1 Pet. 4: 2. Lust, not Holy Scripture, is their Bible. Our apostle thus portrays them as Deists, who reject divine revelation. Benson: "Here is the root of Infidelity, and the grand reason of men's scoffing against religion."

In the last of the days, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν; literally, close to, or near the last of the days: G. K. many others; Syriac version, Ecumenius, Augustine. The other reading is, *in*, or, *near the last days*, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν; A. B. C. many others: Vulgate, Coptic version, Theophylact, Jerome. Both readings express the same thought.

The corresponding Hebrew expression "in the last of the days," or, "in the after part of the days," refers to the future, reckoning from the time of narration or from the time of the speaker; equivalent to *hereafter*. Gen. 49: 1. So Jacob said to his sons, "Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you *in the last of the days*," or in the future of that age or dispensation in which we now live. Num. 24: 14; Deut. 31: 29; Isa. 2: 2; Mic. 4: 1; Dan. 10: 14. "Knowing this first, that there shall come *in the last of the days* scoffers," etc., means, there shall come hereafter scorers, or in the future of that age or dispensation in which we now live. "*The days*" can only mean, in this expression, the times in which you and I are now living; and "*the last of the days*," in the future of the Christian dispensation; usage admits of no other explanation.

Once indeed the sacred writer reckons backward instead of forward; "God hath *in the last of these days* spoken to us by his Son," *i. e.*, at the end of the Jewish dispensation, which mingled with the beginning of the Christian. The Mosaic economy died when Christ said, "It is finished," John 19: 30; Matt. 27: 51; but it was not buried until after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans and the dispersion of the Jews; since which time it has been impossible for them to worship God according to the pre-

cepts of the Mosaic Law. Compare Heb. 9: 26, Gr., and 1 Pet. 1: 19, 20, Gr.

The sense then is: ‘In the future of the age or dispensation in which we Christians are now living, there shall come scoffers who shall constantly scoff, not reason; men, whose Bible or rule of life is not the writings of prophets and apostles, not the will of God thus made known, but their own lusts, or sinful inclinations.’ All the skeptical writings from Herbert to Strauss, to say nothing of Celsus and Julian, prove that Peter’s prediction has been most sadly and convincingly fulfilled. One of these men entitled his work ‘the Age of Reason,’ by a great misnomer; it should have been ‘the Age of Scoffing.’

V. 4. *Where is the promise of his coming?* *Promise*, by metonymy, for the thing promised, as in 1: 4. ‘Where is the fulfilment of the promise as to Christ’s coming?’ The question implies a negative; in the view of the scoffers, it never will be fulfilled. ‘What dependence can be put on that which you Christians call the promise of his coming? If he intends to appear, why has he not done so long ago? He that never means to come, stays long.’ “Where, then, is boasting?” *i. e.*, there is no foundation at all for boasting, according to the doctrine of justification just exhibited. Rom. 3: 27, with 21–26 vs. “O death, where is thy sting?” 1 Cor. 15: 55.

For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue precisely as from the beginning of creation. “They oppose,” says Calvin, “the uniform course of nature to the divine promise, as if these things were contrary, or did not well agree.” The scoffers assume that, since the creation of our world, no miracle, properly so called, has been wrought by God. Hume, for example, said that no amount of evidence could assure posterity of such a fact! As if a whole nation, from the time of Moses till now, had conspired to testify falsely respecting those miracles which God wrought by the Hebrew legislator! But *how*, or on what ground, can any infidel know that the so-called course of nature has been uniform

from the beginning of creation? Only on the ground of human testimony. Strauss says that a miracle is impossible! Impossible! when, then, was the Almighty annihilated? or who has wrested from his hands the control and management of our world? The scorers also take it for granted that no miracle will ever hereafter be wrought by God, and hence that the second coming of Jesus Christ, with all its accompanying and subsequent events, is purely fictitious. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: Jehovah shall have them in derision." Ps. 2: 4.

By *the fathers* is not meant simply the patriarchs; (see Mark 12: 23-27; Heb. 11: 19,) nor the prophets and apostles who may be styled the fathers of the Jewish and Christian Church, and who especially foretold Christ's advent as King and Judge; nor the generation which lived when our Lord was upon earth, most of whom were dead when Peter wrote: but all past generations who believe the promise here referred to; for the scoffers allude to the earliest history of the world and up to their day. (Benson.)

Precisely as, οὐκ ἔστιν, with καὶ ὥς or ὡς implied. (See Luke 24: 24; 1 Cor. 4: 1; Jas. 2: 12; John 7: 46.) *From the beginning of creation:* this phrase occurs also, Mark 10: 6; 13: 19. Paul's form of speech is, "From the creation of the world," Rom. 1: 20. Both mean, ever since the beginning of our world. *To fall asleep* is a natural and beautiful metaphor to denote death. It appertains to the body only. In sleep and death the body rests and is inactive, and one looks like the twin-brother of the other. The sleep of the soul, or its unconscious state from the time of death till the resurrection, may be asserted, but can never be proved. It is directly contrary to all that we know now of the nimbleness and increasing activity of the human spirit, even while dwelling in frail and sickly bodies; it is contrary to the express declaration of our Lord to the penitent thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." But if his soul had fallen

asleep at death, not to awake until Christ's second coming, how could he know *where* he should be? How could he know even that he should exist at all? Neither does this metaphor denote annihilation: it may do for scoffers to call "death an eternal sleep"; but there is no such thing for an intelligent being. What scoffer can *prove* that God will annihilate his body and spirit at death, much as he may desire it?

V. 5, 6. *For this they are willingly ignorant of, that the heavens were of old, and the earth of water and by water constituted, by the word of God; whereby the then world, deluged with water, was destroyed.*

For this they are willingly ignorant of, λαθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας: for this escapes their notice willingly, or they are willingly ignorant of this fact, viz.: *that the heavens were of old; ὅτι ὠρανὰ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι*, that the heavens had an existence long since in the past, Ps. 102: 25. The *heavens* mean the region of the air or atmosphere, of our world. "God called the expanse heavens," Gen. 1: 8; Ps. 8: 8. "Fowl of the heavens." (Iliad 24: 563. οὐδὲ μὲ λήθεις, ὅτι θεῶν τις σ' ἦγε.) So Calvin, Beza, T. Smith, Benson and others.

Bloomfield agrees with those who suppose that the apostle refers to what is said in the preceding verse. 'For it escapes them willingly this,' or who will have it that the course of nature has ever been uniform, and will ever be so. But the pronoun *this* refers not to what goes before, but to that which follows; as in the eighth verse, introduced in both instances by ὅτι=the fact that, "For *this* willingly escapes them, *that* the heavens," etc. "Let not *this* one thing escape you, beloved, *that* one day is with the Lord," etc.

And the earth of water and by water constituted, καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα. There is a diversity of opinion as to the meaning of these words. Calvin: "The world certainly has its origin from the waters; for the chaos from which the earth was produced, Moses calls the waters. It was also sus-

tained by the waters; yet the Lord used the waters to destroy it." He thinks, therefore, that the reference in these words is to the commingled mass of land and water as at first created and then put together by God, and as it existed afterwards. According to this view, Peter speaks of the earth as being put together at first out of the watery commingled mass, and as sustained, owing to the constitution originally given to it; or, of its original creation as a world, and of its conservation to the deluge. (See also McKnight and Benson.)

Our translators render thus: "And the earth standing out of the water and in the water." The word "*standing*" is ambiguous, as Bengel justly says. The marginal translation is "*consisting*." The translation of δ ὕδατος by "*in the water*," cannot be justified. They seem to have been led to this way of translating the preposition, from supposing the apostle to allude to Gen. 1: 9, 10. "And God said, let the waters under the heavens be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land earth," etc. Perhaps their way of understanding this clause, or an approximation to it, may be thus given: 'The heavens were of old, and the earth (arising *from* the water and rushing *through* the water) constituted, by the word of God.' When God said, "Let the dry land appear," the earth arose out of the waters rushed through them, as they were going to their receptacles called seas. Thus, their obedience to the divine fiat is described in the words enclosed in parenthetical marks; but the creation and conservation of the earth, by the participle *constituted*. It is the perfect participle, συνεστῶσα, and happily expresses, according to either view, both creation and conservation: 'Having been at first put together and still remaining so.'

The former interpretation seems to us alone accurate. The scoffers say that since the beginning of creation, the course of nature has been uniform. Not so, says our apostle, unless you choose to ignore the fact of the deluge. "The heavens were

very long ago ;” they have not existed from eternity, but only for a long time in the past. How then did they come into existence ? *By the word of God, and so also was the earth constituted ;* being originally made or put together as a world by the divine fiat out of the water, or commingled mass spoken of by Moses, and kept together by means of the original constitution given to it until the flood, Col. 1 : 16, 17. “All things were created by him and for him ; and he is before all, and *all things in him consist*,” ἐν αὐτῷ συνεστῆκε ; *i. e.*, all things were originally created, constituted or put together by him, and are still kept together by him ; or, “the universe stands together leaning on him,” he “upholds it by the word of his power,” Heb. 1 : 3.

In the Mosaic account of the creation of our world, “God said,” is a phrase often occurring. It means, God showed his almighty power, he expressed his will, so that the effect instantly followed. “God said, Light be, and light was,” Ps. 33 : 9. “For he spake, and it was ; he commanded, and it was made to stand,” 6 v. “By the word of Jehovah the heavens were made ; and by the breath of his mouth all their hosts.” “The word of God” therefore, as here used by Peter, is the same as God’s command, almighty will, or fiat.

Whereby the then world, deluged with water, was destroyed (or, perished.) Whereby, δι’ ὧν=by which ; *i. e.*, by which constitution of things, or by so constituting our world, it was destroyed by the deluge. The waters of the heavens or atmosphere, and the waters of the earth, under the direction and control of the Almighty, destroyed it, Gen. 7 : 11. *The then world*, ὁ τότε κόσμος, the world as it is existed from the creation till the flood ; the reference being especially to the material world, though not to the exclusion of its inhabitants, 2 : 5. The then world *was destroyed*, or perished, ἀπώλετο. The reference is to the physical disruptions and changes caused by the deluge ; water being used by God to make a ruin of our earth, which he had created of water, and by means of it sustained ; the very materials made and used in build-

ing and upholding the material globe being employed by him to effect an alteration in its structure for the worse. The antediluvians for example, must have moved about under more genial heavens, or breathed a healthier atmosphere than men since the flood, otherwise their stay on earth could not have approximated to a thousand years.

The then world was destroyed, is an allusion to Gen. 6: 13. "And God said to Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, *I will destroy them with the earth.*' *Eth* (Heb.) is properly rendered "with," (as in Gen. 5: 24,) and often elsewhere. The apostle thus teaches that a most remarkable miracle had taken place, altering for the worse the material globe on which we still live, as well as destroying its inhabitants. And hence the coming of Christ, with all the events associated in Scripture with it, is not at all improbable. He who has left the prints of his curse on the post-diluvian earth, and who drowned all but eight of the ante-diluvians is the same God still, and when Christ comes, he will scorn the scorers, Prov. 3: 34.

The apostle, in this context, mentions three forms or conditions of our world. First, the ante-diluvian world, which he calls "the then world," or our world as it was from its creation to the deluge. Second, the post-diluvian, our present world, which he calls "the now heavens and earth;" or our world as it has existed from the deluge until now, and will exist, retaining its present state, until Christ comes as Judge, 7: 10-12 vs. Third, the future world, "the new heavens and earth, in which dwelleth righteousness;" or the future renovated condition of our world as the permanent abode of the justified and sanctified, at Christ's coming as King; "the world to come," or future habitable earth, Heb. 2: 5.

V. 7. *But the now heavens and earth by his word are stored up, kept for fire at the day of judgment and perdition of these ungodly men.*

But, that is, notwithstanding all the scoffing of the scoffers, (3, 4 vs.,) jeering at Christ's coming as a fable. *The now heavens and earth*, our present world, or the condition of the earth and its atmosphere as it now exists: these words are contrasted with "the then world," (6 v.,) or the earth with its atmosphere as it was up to the deluge, 5 v. *By his word*, almighty will or fiat, *are stored up*, put like treasures in their proper storehouses or receptacles. See Ps. 33: 7. God has stored up the heavens and earth which are now, put the present atmosphere and earth safely away, or arranged them each in its proper place and position, and is still treasuring them up in this manner; which the perfect tense indicates: *τεθροσσωρισμένοι εἰς*. The metaphor beautifully describes the perfect stability and duration of our world, as it now is, until the coming of the Judge. *Kept for fire*, *πρὸς τηρόμενοι*, secured or reserved to be subjected, not to the action of water, (Gen. 9: 11,) but of fire. *Kept for fire at the day of judgment and perdition of these ungodly men*: that is, our world with its atmosphere will be subjected to the action of fire when these ungodly men shall be judged and destroyed. The preposition *εἰς*, when connected with words indicative of time, means *up to, when, or at*; 'kept for fire *up to* the day of judgment and destruction,' etc. 2: 9; 1 Pet. 1: 11. "Searching *up to* what [season] or what sort of time," etc., *i. e.*, the prophets endeavored to find out *when* the Christ was to appear, and what the moral character of the age would be, 1 Thess. 4: 15. "We the living who survive *up to* the coming of the Lord," or when he shall have come, Phil. 1: 10. "That ye be sincere and without offence *up to* Christ's day," 2: 16. "For rejoicing to me *up to* Christ's day," at that time. *The day of judgment and destruction*, the appointed time of trial and consequent punishment, consisting in the loss, not of being, but of well-being, 2: 9. *Perdition or destruction*: the original word is explained on 2: 1. *These ungodly men*: literally, *the ungodly men*, or the before-mentioned ungodly men, equivalent to 'these ungodly men.' The scoffers are intended,

3 v. 'Our earth with its atmosphere will be kept in being as they now are until the coming of our Lord; but they will be subjected to the operation of fire when he arrives to judge and punish these irreverent scoffers.' B. C. G. K. Syriac version have "By his word," $\tau\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$: A. and Vulgate, "By the same word."

V. 8. *But, beloved, be not ye ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.* 'In the sight or judgment of the Lord a millennium and a day are alike. He who inhabits eternity neither hastens nor delays the execution of his coming.' "Time," says Nordheimer, "is the constant influx and efflux of moments, whose beginning and ending are lost in eternity;" or, time is nothing but a bit of eternity, broken off at both ends; but we, while expecting good, think day long and night tedious, and the very small bit in our hands of huge dimensions—not so our Lord, who is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Heb. 13: 8. (Compare Ps. 90: 4, to which our apostle alludes, and the expressions of which he alters. Moses, in that Psalm, contrasts God's eternity with man's mortality; and says that in the judgment of Jehovah a thousand years are what yesterday is to men when it is past, or a watch in the night. Peter says, that the purpose of God in flesh as to his coming will surely be effected, and that a thousand years and a day are alike to him in this particular; he neither hastens nor delays, and is immutably faithful.) Bengel: *Dei ænologium* (sic appellare liceat) differt ab *horologio* mortalium. . . . Ei nec tardius nec celerius labuntur tempora, quam Ipsi et æconomiae ejus aptum est: *i. e.*, "God's *eternity-clock* (if we may so speak,) differs from the *time-piece* of mortals. As to him, the times glide away neither more slowly nor more swiftly, but they pass by in such a manner as he deems best, and in accordance with his plan, or economy of the universe." Benson: "It makes no difference with God, whether the thing, which he has engaged to do, is to be performed, now or a thou-

sand years hence; he will as certainly and punctually accomplish it, and time makes no alteration as to his wisdom, goodness, power, or veracity. Calvin: "Now he directs his discourse to the pious, and admonishes them to lift their eyes upward, when the subject treated of is Christ's advent; for if we do so, we cannot subject the time prescribed by God to our preposterous wishes. For on this account it seems too long to wait, because we have our eyes fastened on the shortness of the present life; we also increase our weariness by reckoning days, hours, and moments. But when the eternity of God's kingdom occurs to us, many ages vanish like a moment. Hither therefore, the apostle recalls us, in order that we may know that the day of resurrection does not depend on the present flow of the times, but on God's eternal counsel."

V. 9. *The promised Lord delays not, as some think it a delay; but is long-suffering towards you, not willing that any be destroyed, but that all come to repentance.*

The promised Lord delays not; ὁ βραδύναι λόπιος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας: literally, "Lord of the promise"=the promised Lord. So it is in A. B. C. The promised Lord *delays not*, does not loiter or linger; comp. 2: 3. He has not put off his coming, or he is not slow therein, *as some think it a delay* or slowness; that is, as the scoffers, who think that our Lord travels so slowly that he will never arrive in this world.

The other reading, adopted by our translators, is found in G. K., and makes no alteration in the sense: ὁ being prefixed to λόπιος. *The Lord delays not the promise*, or he is not slow as to fulfilling it, as the scoffers assume. The Vulgate thus: "The Lord delays not his promise, as some think."

Here the apostle teaches us that the reason why our Lord has not yet come, is *not* because he is unable or unwilling to fulfil that engagement; and that in truth, with respect to him, there is no delay at all in coming, inasmuch as he will come at the appointed season, and neither sooner nor later. Compare 1 Tim. 6:

15, ἣν (sc. ἐπιφανεσίαν) καιρῶτις ἰδίῳις, etc., “which (appearing, 14 v.,) in its own season the blessed and only potentate will show. *But is long-suffering towards you*, etc. The apostle having declared that, so far as our Lord is concerned, there is no delay in respect of his promised coming, now teaches us that his apparent delay, as men view it, is owing to his unspeakable patience and kindness towards believers, and to afford sinners opportunities for repentance. (*Towards you*, εἰς ὑμᾶς: in favor of εἰς are B. C. G. K., of ὑμᾶς A. B. C. *Towards us*, εἰς ἡμᾶς, δι’ ὑμᾶς. A. Vulgate. But these various readings, as usual, leave the sense unchanged.)

Not willing that any be destroyed, but that all come to repentance. Clement of Rome, as already said in the introduction, seems to have understood these words of God’s elect. “He hath established it, then, by his almighty will,” (referring to Ezek. 33: 11,) “inasmuch as he is willing that all his beloved partake of repentance;” (literally, “willing that all his beloved partake of repentance.”) Here Clement unquestionably refers to 2 Pet. 3: 8, 9. He considers Peter as addressing only the *beloved*, and that God’s almighty will, decree or oath, as mentioned by Ezekiel, takes effect upon *all such*, or that God wills that they all partake of repentance. So also Beza: “The reason why the last day doth not instantly come, is because of God’s long suffering to the elect; not willing that any of them should perish, but that all be brought to repentance.”

These interpretations are not so untenable as some imagine. Peter is certainly addressing God’s people. ‘The Lord delays not as to his promised coming, as some weak and trembling believers at times suppose, but, on the other hand, he is long suffering towards you, not willing that any of you his beloved perish, but that you all come to repentance.’ Thus, in substance, Owen, (“The Death of death in the death of Christ.” Book 4, chap. 4.)

Calvin gives a very different interpretation: “He restrains their excessive and foolish haste by another reason, viz.: that the

Lord puts off his advent in order to invite all mankind to repentance:" ut totum humanum genus ad pœnitentiam invitet. But has not Peter predicted the coming of Christ as Judge of the wicked, and especially of false teachers and scoffers, and showed the certainty and justice of their future everlasting punishment? And how can such a prediction be reconciled with the declaration before us that God is not willing that any sinner should be destroyed, but that all should come to repentance? In this way: while God is immutably determined to punish hereafter impenitent sinners persisting in their sins, and has made known this his purpose by prophets and apostles, yet, at the same time, he takes no pleasure in their destruction. He has no delight in their loss of everlasting life, but would rather behold them humbling themselves before him on account of their sins. In our judgment, Peter certainly alludes to Ezek. 33: 11. "*As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?*" Compare Ezek. 18: 23, 32. Satan and his lawless clan may perhaps exult for a moment as sinners of mankind are hurled into hell. But God is no inquisitor general, and God in flesh wept over lost souls on Mount Olivet; their destruction does not gratify him, even though their sins richly deserve it, and, if they persist in them, shall receive it. The restriction of these words therefore to the elect is unnecessary, and repugnant to Peter's scope; which is to show that the delay of Christ's coming, as men view it, is not only for the salvation of believers or the beloved, (compare 15 v.) but also to afford *any* sinner however degraded, and *all* sinners indiscriminately, opportunities for repentance.

Not willing that any be destroyed, μή βουλόμενος τις ἀπολέσθαι. Now, to *will* means not only to *purpose*, or determine beforehand to do or abstain from doing any thing, but also to *desire* or wish to *take pleasure* or delight in doing or not doing. And this is quite natural, for desire goes immediately before determination, and

leads to it. The apostle here uses the participle in the sense of desiring or taking delight in. ‘The Lord Jesus takes no pleasure in the everlasting misery of any.’

According to Buttman, *βούλομαι* (here used by Peter,) means ‘to wish or desire, *θέλω* or *ἐθέλω* to purpose or determine. In Hellenistic Greek, this distinction is *not always* observed. (And whether it is always so in classical Greek, is a question which does not at present concern us.) The verb *θέλω* is only twice found in Peter’s epistles, 1 Pet. 3: 10. “For he that *will* love life,” that is, he who *is determined* to enjoy life, 2 Pet. 3: 5. “For this escapes” (is hidden from) “them *willing* ;” literally: *i. e.*, their ignorance of this fact is voluntary, *determined* or obstinate. They not only do not wish to know it, but *are determined*, if possible, to drive it from their recollection. *Peter*, therefore, accurately observes the above-mentioned distinction, and thus our interpretation of this clause is confirmed. Besides, the subjective negative is used, intimating that such is the mind of our Lord that he is not capable of delight or pleasure in the death of any of the wicked, Matt. 1: 19. “Joseph, her husband, being righteous, and *not purposing* (*μὴ θέλων*) to expose her to public disgrace, *was desirous* (*ἐβουλόθη*) of divorcing her privately,” Mark 15: 15. “But Pilate, *wishing* (*βουλόμενος*) to satisfy the people.” Acts 17: 20, where Athenians speak: “*We desire* (*βουλόμεθα*) therefore to know what one *may determine* these things to be,” (*τί ἂν θέλοι πάντα εἶναι*) or, ‘what these things mean:’ compare Acts 2: 12, Gr.; Phil. 1: 12. “*I wish* you to know,” etc.: *βούλομαι*.

But that all come to repentance, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρίζει. ‘The Lord Jesus takes no pleasure in the everlasting misery of any, but on the other hand, he delights in seeing all sinners confessing and forsaking their sins.’ Or, ‘Not desiring their destruction and taking no pleasure in it, but rather taking pleasure in their repentance.’ Compare Rom. 9: 22. “But if God, determining (*θέλων*) to manifest his wrath,” (just indignation against

sinful men,) “and to make known his power, *endured with much long suffering* vessels of wrath fitted for destruction.” Here Paul agrees with Peter in declaring that God is determined to punish obstinate and persevering sinners, but he teaches, at the same time, that God shows remarkable and long continued kindness even to those who by their sins become ripe for destruction, and that such must, notwithstanding God’s much long-suffering, be the recipients of punishment. Neither Paul nor Peter, then, restrict God’s long suffering to the elect; and so the interpretation we have given is fixed on an immovable foundation. The verb *χωρησαι* is *here* intransitive, and means to make room or space for one’s self, and hence to come, as in Matt. 15: 17; John 8: 37. “Because my word comes not in you,” *i. e.*, because it comes not and abides in you, or it has no place in your hearts. As *τινας* is the subject accusative of *ἀπολέσθαι*, so *πάντας* is of *χωρησαι*, because both depend on the verbum sentiendi, *βουλόμενος*. [Sometimes the verb is seemingly transitive, or takes an object accusative: 2 Cor. 7: 2. “Make room for us” (in your affections,) or “receive us,” Matt. 19: 11.] *Repentance*, *μετάνοια*, a change of mind as to sin, and as to God, whose law is violated by transgression, Acts 20: 21.

Thus the apostle has shown that the assumption of the scoffers is false in fact, and hence that their inference derived from it is worthless, and also that our Lord has the best and most affecting reasons for his apparent delay.

¹⁰But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in which the heavens with a great noise shall pass by; moreover, the kindled elements shall be dissolved, and the earth and the works on it shall be burned. ¹¹Since then all these things are to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, ¹²looking for and urging on the coming of the day of God, by reason of which the fired heavens shall be dissolved, and the kindled elements be melted? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

V. 10. *But*, that is, notwithstanding what scoffers may say to

the contrary: *the day of the Lord will come*, the appointed time will arrive when the Lord Jesus will appear in our world to manifest his power, justice and mercy. It will come *as a thief in the night*, in a sudden and unexpected manner; probably to all, as a flash of lightning; which is not only conspicuous to all, but sudden, Matt. 24: 27; Luke 17: 24. Our Saviour, however, has given signs or indications by which its near approach may be determined, (Mat. 24: 32-34,) though not its precise or exact season, Matt. 24: 36. The coming of a thief at night is not only sudden and unexpected, but causes alarm and anguish to the family thus startled from their slumbers. And this day will cause the scoffers, and all lovers of sin, to be filled with the greatest alarm and distress, so that they shall in vain wish for annihilation, 7 v., Rev. 6: 16-17. To them it will come as the flood on the antediluvians, as the destruction of the cities of the Plain, Luke 17: 26-30.

Not so, however, to the pious who love the Lord and obey him. *This day shall not seize them as a thief*, (1 Thess. 5: 4,) it shall cause no alarm and anguish to them. On the contrary, they *urge it on*, or earnestly long and pray for its arrival; they *look for* it constantly as the time of their complete redemption in soul and body, 12 v. And when it has come, they will rejoice with exceeding great joy, (1 Pet. 4: 13,) for they know that then there shall be richly furnished to them an entrance into the everlasting kingdom of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, 1: 11.

The words, *ἐν νύκτι*, "in the night," are found in C. G. K., but not in A. B. Griesbach, Lachmann and Tischendorf omit them; perhaps assuming that they were added by some scribe from 1 Thess. 5: 2. But it is as probable that they are genuine, and that Peter here alludes to that passage.

In which (day) the heavens with a great noise shall pass by: *ἐν ᾗ* (sc. ἡμέρᾳ). *The heavens*=the atmosphere, as in 5, 7, 13 vs. *With a great noise*, or *with a rushing sound*, *βοῆζοντος*. The noun *βοῆζος*, (Iliad 16: 361,) means the whizzing of an arrow; Oyds.

9 : 315,) it is used to denote the noise made by a shepherd driving his flock. Plutarch, of the roar of the winds, ῥοιζὸς πνευμάτων. *Shall pass by* παρελεύσονται: the verb literally means to come along side of; hence to come near, and to pass by. Luke 12 : 37. "He will come near, and serve them." Luke 18 : 37. "They told him, Jesus of Nazereth was passing by." There is nothing absurd in supposing that the verb is to be taken in its strict literal signification: 'The atmosphere with a great noise shall rush along, and come near the earth.' (The adverb ῥοιζῶν implies swiftness of motion, as well as noise.) Commentators, however, generally suppose that the verb is metaphorical, and equivalent in meaning to *pass away*, or *perish*. It must be admitted that this view is favored by Matt. 24 : 35 ; Mark 13 : 31 ; Luke 21 : 33. But if there is a metaphor in the verb, the meaning is not that the atmosphere will be annihilated, but that it shall pass away as now constituted; for that which is to be *renovated*, is not to be blotted out of existence, 13 v. And the renovation of the heavens by the removal of noxious qualities, will most probably, instantly follow the destruction of their present constitution.

In the twelfth verse the apostle says: *The fired heavens shall be dissolved*, οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται, *i. e.*, or, the heavens set on fire shall be loosened. Fire, then, is to act on our present atmosphere, and the effect of its action is expressed by λυθήσονται. *i. e.*, shall be loosened, let loose, dissolved or separated. 'The Lord, in causing our atmosphere, as it now is, to pass away, will employ fire to separate or set free its present noxious qualities.'

Moreover, the kindled elements shall be dissolved, στοιχῆα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσονται. *Moreover*, δέ continuative. Kindled, set on fire, from καυσόμαι. *The elements*, first principles or component parts of a thing. *Paul* uses the word to denote elementary instruction in the gospel, a teaching of its alphabet, or fundamental principles, Heb. 5 : 12. He calls the religious instruction given to mankind in the infancy of our race the "elements of the world," τὰ στοιχῆα τοῦ κόσμου, (Gal. 4 : 1-3 ; Col. 2 : 20,) or the

rudimental instruction given to men when infants, *ὑπὸ τοῖς*, minors, or under the age of manhood. And he especially refers to the additions made to divine revelation by human tradition, and by false and deceitful philosophy, contrasting this medley with the true gospel, Col. 2 : 8. *Peter*, however, is predicting the change that is to be wrought by our Lord at his coming in our material globe, with the heavens belonging to it. It is evident, therefore, that he uses the word "elements" in its physical sense. See *LXX.* Wisd. 19 : 18 ; 7 : 17 and *στοιχειώσιν*, 2 Macc. 7 : 22.

Thomas Dick, if we remember right, understands the word elements here thus: 'the elements of which our present atmosphere is composed.' These shall be set on fire and be separated. But the passing away of our air as at present constituted is predicted in the preceding clause. Besides, in the twelfth verse, the apostle says: "The kindled elements are melted;" or "shall be melted." But melting is a process pertaining to solid bodies only. His explanation of the clause therefore is untenable.

Elements, then, must be referred to the earth, and the sense is: our present atmosphere, or the atmosphere as it now is, shall with a rushing sound be destroyed; moreover, solid substances of the earth shall be dissolved, or set free from their present position by the operation of fire.

And the earth and the works on it shall be burned, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα κατακαήσεται And the earth: the first and, or *καί*, is equivalent to *and hence*, or *and so*, which has been before justified by usage. 'Solid component parts of the dry ground shall be set on fire, and let loose from the positions they now occupy, and so the earth and the works on it shall be burned down.' *To burn down*, in our idiom, is either *to burn up*, utterly consume, or simply to *burn*, *κατα* intensive, as in 3 : 13 ; 2 : 8. Tyndale's version (edition of 1526) is: "And the earth, with the works that are therein shall burn." When it is said, "The earth shall be burned," it is not necessary to suppose that the apostle meant to predict its annihilation; for fire annihilates nothing, but only changes

the forms of bodies. Nor is it necessary to assume that the earth shall be reduced to its original chaotic state, by the fire operating from the surface to the centre. "The works *on it* shall be burned;" $\varepsilon\nu$ =on, as in 1: 18.

The Lord Jesus might, if such were his will, reduce the present earth to atoms, or annihilate it with its atmosphere, so that it should no longer be a habitable world, after his coming. They who are of this mind often cite Shakspeare, in order to garnish their discourse, and make it end well:

"The cloud-capt towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples; the great globe itself,
And all that it inherits shall dissolve,
And, like the baseless fabric of a vision,
Leave not a wreck behind."

But the question is not what our Lord can do in this matter, but what he has foretold he will do concerning it, by his prophets and apostles. To explain the prediction before us of the annihilation of the earth as a habitable world, is to deny what Peter himself has stated in a three-fold manner. (1) He declares that "the works on the earth shall be burned;" whether this relates to the works of men, or of God, or of both, is but of trifling importance, so far as pertains to this question. Now, if the words, "The earth shall be burned," mean the earth shall be annihilated, it would have been the essence of nonsense for the apostle to have added, "The works on it shall be burned too." (2) By contrasting the destruction of the antediluvian world by water, with the burning of the present world by fire, Peter demonstrates that *he* never dreamed, as many of his interpreters have done, of its annihilation, 6, 7 vs. (3.) The prediction in 13 v. is especially designed to refute such an assumption. "But" (that is, notwithstanding what I have just said, 7: 10-12 vs.,) "we, according to his promise, look for the new heavens and earth;" we expect our earth with its atmosphere to be renovated, not annihilated.

Calvin: De mundi elementis hoc unum dicam, absumptum iri, *tantum ut novam qualitatem induant: manente substantia*, sicut ex (Rom. 8: 21,) et aliis locis facile colligi potest . . . Sic enim ratioeinatur, *cælum et terram incendio purgatum iri, ut regno Christi respondeant.* . . . *Corruptio cæli et terre igne purgabitur.* “Of the elements of our world I will only say this one thing; they shall be taken away, but only so as to put on a new quality, the substance remaining; as may easily be inferred from Rom. 8: 21, and other passages. . . . (His meaning is, that heaven and earth will be so cleansed by the burning as to correspond to Christ’s kingdom,) . . . The corruption of heaven and earth shall be cleansed by fire.” (Compare Belgic Confession, XXXVII.) See Rom. 8: 19–22, where Paul predicts that the whole of our world shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption to which it has been subjected; and that this renovation of our world is to take place at the time of the public manifestation of God’s children, or when they receive the redemption of their body, 23 v.

The annihilation of our earth and its heavens or atmosphere, is also contrary to the oracles of Christ’s holy prophets, to which we should give heed, according to Peter’s injunction, 1: 19; 3: 2. “He founded the earth on its bases; *it shall not be shaken*” (or, *it shall not be moved* from its foundations,) “*for ever and ever,*” Ps. 104: 5; that is it shall exist to all eternity. Ps. 104: 31. “*The glory of Jehovah shall be for ever; Jehovah shall rejoice in his works.*” By a careful reading of this Psalm, any one can see that the earth, with its atmosphere and sea, its sun and moon, is spoken of. “*The glory of Jehovah*” means the manifestation of his excellencies or perfections, as in Ps. 19: 1. This glory, as exhibited in our world, *shall be for ever.* But how can this be, if it is to be blotted out of existence? *Jehovah shall rejoice in his works:* this implies that our world, the work of his hands, is to be renovated, and become again as it was when he beheld every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good,

(Gen. 1 : 31,) no sinners being on earth, (Ps 104 : 35,) so that the Creator himself rejoiced or took delight in it all. And this renovation is expressly predicted, Ps. 102 : 25-27. Compare Heb. 1 : 10-12.

Some think that the conflagration on the earth's surface will be confined to a part of the earth ; at that place, or those places, where the open and obstinate enemies of Christ are assembled at his coming. And it seems to be clearly foretold that, although the Lord is to come with fire, for the destruction of his enemies, (Isa. 66 : 14-16 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 7, 8,) still all men are not to be removed from the earth, Isa. 66 : 18, 19, 20. Compare Zech. 14 : 16, with 1-5 vs. (1 Thess. 3 : 13.) In Ps. 97 : 3, it is said : "Fire shall go before him, and consume his enemies round about." And this will be when the King and Lord of the whole earth has come, Ps. 97 : 1, 5. (Compare Ps. 97 : 7 with Heb. 1 : 6.) In Isa. 66 : 15, the literal version is, "For behold, Jehovah *in fire* shall come ;" but the next verse shows that He is not simply to be in the midst of fire, or surrounded by it, but employ it to destroy his enemies in great multitudes. Paul says : "And to you who are afflicted, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, *in fire of flame* ; he giving retribution to them who know not God, and to them who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. 1 : 7, 8. The *Lord Jesus*, then, is *the Jehovah* who shall appear *in fiery flame*, to punish his enemies : a comparison with Isa. 66 : 15, 16, and Ps. 9 : 73, renders it highly probable that he will not only be surrounded with fiery flame, but use it to destroy his enemies. Compare 2 Pet. 3 : 7. "Kept for fire at the day of judgment and destruction of these ungodly men ;" which seems to intimate that the fire is not only to operate on the heavens and earth, but also on the scoffers, as the waters of the deluge not only altered for the worse our material globe, but also took away its inhabitants. Besides, "the earth shall be burned," may be used by synecdoche, the whole for a part ; as in Matt. 27 : 51, "The earth did quake ;"

which was confined to Jerusalem, or Judea. The conflagration on the earth's surface, whatever shall be its extent, will also, it is probable, be employed to burn the curse out of it, (Gen. 3: 17-19,) or to render it more fruitful, and fitter for the residence of the redeemed, 13 v.

V. 11. *Since then all these things are to be dissolved*, τούτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων, "all these things then *being dissolved*:" it is the present participle, and is equivalent to *are to be dissolved*. So in 1 Pet. 1: 13. "Hope for the grace *that is brought* to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ;" i. e., that is to be brought to you, or put into your hands, when the Saviour shall appear. Or, as Winer explains: "Since all these things are by their nature intended to be dissolved—in these things the lot of dissolution is already inherent. The future participle would indicate mere futurity." The full and exact sense therefore may be expressed as follows: 'Since then all these things are in their nature dissolvable, and intended to be dissolved.' The apostle founds his exhortation to the cultivation of the highest degree of holiness on the fact that the changes which are to occur in our world when Christ has come, will be for their eternal benefit, (13 v.,) and hence that they should not only expect, but urge on the coming of that day, 12 v. *What manner of persons ought ye to be?* Here some put an interrogation mark, and consider the words following as the answer. 'Ye ought to be persons persevering in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for,' etc. This mode of punctuation gives the true meaning; but in no respects better than the mode followed by our translators, who seem to consider the question and answer intermingled, as is quite natural in the outpouring of deep feeling. So also Bloomfield. Ye ought to be persons *persevering in* (ἐν) *holy conversations and godlinesses*. Conversation and godliness are plural in the original; probably, to denote the various ways in which we are to be holy, or obey our Lord in reference to both tables of the moral law; which is well expressed by our translators: "in *all* holy

conversation and godliness." Compare 1 Pet. 1 : 15. *Conversation*, ἀναστροφή, means literally turning about or walk ; hence, manner of life, behavior, 1 Pet. 1 : 15, 18 ; 2 : 12 ; 3 : 1, 2, 16 ; 2 Pet. 2 : 7, and here, conversation, as distinguished from godliness, relates to our duty towards men, 1 : 7.

B. C. have *οὕτως* instead of *οὕ*, but the latter is found in A. G. K. and Vulgate: cum hæc igitur omnia dissolvenda sint.

V. 12. Ye ought to be persons persevering in the discharge of your whole duty to men and God, while you are *looking for and urging on the coming of the day of God*, etc. The participles present are used, *προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας*. *Looking for*, or waiting for, expecting. *Urging on the coming of the day of God*, hastening it. What we desire intensely, we would hasten, if in our power: the metaphor therefore happily denotes the great desire we should feel for the speedy approach of this day, and how earnestly we should express such desire in fervent and persevering prayer. "Lord Jesus, 'why tarry the wheels of thy chariots?'" Come quickly, Isa. 66 : 15 ; Rev. 22 : 20. How perfectly this vigilance in holy duties, combined with ardent hope, agrees with Peter's mode of thinking, is evident from 1 Pet. 1 : 13. *The day of God*: the day of the Lord, is the usual phrase, corresponding to the Hebrew, the day of Jehovah, 10 v. (See Mal. 4th chapter ; Zech. 14.) Peter alters the usual expression to intimate, incidentally and concisely, his view of Jesus our Lord, viz.: that he is *the God*, *τὸ θεὸν*, or true God as well as man, 1 : 1, 17 ; 3 : 18 ; 1 John 5 : 20. It is the *coming* of Jesus Christ, the Lord and Saviour, (3 : 1, 4,) that is maintained against the scoffers ; and the time of his appearing is *the day of the Lord*, the time in which Jehovah-Jesus will manifest and magnify his power, justice, and tender mercy: it is perfectly arbitrary therefore to explain "the day of God" of the Father's appearing. Christ alone, God-man, is to come to our world as King and Judge ; he who is "our God and Saviour," (1 : 1,) "the great God and our Saviour," (Tit. 2 : 13,) the same Jesus Christ who

died for us, Tit. 2 : 14. It is the day of God the Father in this sense: the day appointed by him, or the day in which the Father has appointed his Son to appear, (Acts 17 : 31 ; Rom. 2 : 16 ; 1 Cor. 4 : 5 ; 2 Cor. 5 : 10 ; Rom. 14 : 10-12,) in and by whom he will act as judge ; and for whom he has appointed an everlasting kingdom in the new heavens and earth, Luke 22 : 29.

By reason of which, δι' ἧς, 'through which,' or 'on account of which,' as in 2 : 2. 'By reason of which coming of the day of God, the fired heavens shall be dissolved,' etc., *i. e.*, on account of the coming of Christ at the time, and for the purposes, appointed by the Father, the heavens and earth shall undergo a great change, preparing them for your everlasting benefit, (13 v.,) ἧς refers more particularly to παρουσίαν. But if it refers to ἡμέρας, the sense is the same ; the arrival of the day of Christ's appearing, appointed by the Father. Time, in itself considered, or time that is to come, can produce no such physical changes in our world as are predicted in this context. They will be wrought by the agency of God in flesh, and in that great day, "for which all other days were made."

A. B. G. K. have τηξεταί, C. and Vulgate, τασησεταί. The remaining part of this verse has been explained on 10 v.

V. 13. *Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for the new heavens and the new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness*, The particle δὲ is here strongly adversative, = but notwithstanding, or nevertheless, as it is happily rendered in the common version. 'Notwithstanding what I have just foretold concerning the dissolution of our present heavens and earth, they shall by no means be annihilated. On the contrary we expect the earth, with its atmosphere, to be renovated ; and our expectation has the best possible foundation, viz., our Lord's promise by Isaiah.' The apostle does not say, we expect another heavens and another earth, but *new*, that is renewed ; the substance remaining, but the qualities or properties changed for the better, Rev. 21 : 3-7 ; (2 Cor. 5 : 17.) *In which, or wherein dwelleth righteousness* :

ἐν οἷς, referring to the heavens and earth, or renovated world: constructio ad sensum: 'In which renovated world.' Sin has reigned, and still reigns, in our world, but when Christ comes grace and righteousness shall reign. Now *righteousness* is a quality of the mind, and has no existence apart from beings who are intelligent; it is unquestionably a metonymy of the quality for the persons in whom the quality exists; "righteousness" for the righteous, as "the circumcision" for the circumcised, Eph. 5: 8. "For ye were once *darkness*, but now are ye *light* in the Lord;" where *darkness* and *light* are used by metonymy for persons once *darkened*, or ignorant, sinful and wretched, and for persons now *enlightened*, or the opposite of the former. Accordingly the sense is: Our renovated world is to be the permanent dwelling-place or home of the righteous.

We look for this *according to his promise*, Isa. 65: 17; 66: 22. "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith Jehovah, so shall your seed and your name remain." J. Addison Alexander interprets Isaiah 65: 17, and 66: 22, as indicative of a great and glorious change in the then existing state of the church, not precisely defined by the prophet; a change of dispensation from the Jewish to the Christian, (if we rightly understand him,) in which the church is to be, as it were, re-created. The lamented Alexander needs no commendations from us; but this explanation of the prophet is arbitrary, and a result of that origenistic or allegorical mode of interpretation which disfigures a work, marked, in other respects, by genius, good taste, and exceedingly accurate learning. His interpretation is arbitrary, because, for example, in words above quoted Isaiah employs no allegory; but a metaphor in the words *standing* and *stand*, translated "remain." "The new heavens and the new earth *which* I will make standing before me, saith Jehovah:" literally, "So your seed and your name shall stand." The principal or pervading figure, however, is a simile or comparison, the characteristic of which is that the things compared

must be literally understood. Accordingly the meaning of the prophet is: 'As the renovated condition of the earth and its atmosphere, which I will make shall be everlasting (standing before Jehovah) so shall your descendants and your name or fame be everlasting.' And thus Peter understood it, as is evident from the whole preceding context of the apostle; but if we adopt Alexander's views, then we make the apostle say, 'We expect hereafter to enjoy the benefits of the Christian Dispensation, as the Lord has promised us by Isaiah!'

Hammond explains (3: 10-13,) of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish Church-state, followed by the establishment of the Christian church and dispensation. But this is extravagant, far-fetched and absurd. By going over this chapter in this way, or starting from the thirteenth verse backward to the first, we arrive at an allegorical day of the Lord, with allegorical people expecting it; a long-suffering of the Lord that means nothing; an allegorical deluge; an allegorical creation and conservation of our heavens and earth; and an allegorical God, Creator and Lord: *stat nominis umbra*; allegorical scoffers; prophecies and apostolic writings that never were extant; allegorical christians in Asia Minor; an allegorical Simon Peter; and an allegorical Christ, whom he pretends to serve!

To maintain that the words, "the new heavens and the new earth," mean Heaven, as used in the ordinary religious dialect, is "to bring a sense to scripture, not to take one from it." Such should prove that Heaven, the present home of disembodied saints, is spoken of in Holy Writ by the name Earth, with descriptive adjectives, such as old or new. If there be such a passage in any part of scripture, let it be adduced. Until this is done, such an explanation may justly be designated as one falsely so called; one, far-fetched, and wholly repugnant to the preceding context. Besides, Isa. 65: 17-25, and 66: 10-22, demonstrate to all, not prejudiced by theories of their own or

others' devising, that our earth is meant, not the present abode of disembodied saints.

It is the uniform doctrine of scripture that our world is to be the home of the righteous, and the place of our Lord's everlasting kingdom. (See on 1 : 11.) So we are taught in Ps. 2. (Compare Ps. 2 : 2 with Rev. 11 : 15.) Also in Ps. 38, with Matt. 5 : 5 ; Ps. 45 ; Ps. 67 ; Ps. 72 ; Ps. 96 ; and 97 and 98 ; Isa. 9 : 6, 7, with Luke 1 : 31-33 ; Isa. 11 and 12 ; Dan. 2 : 44 and 7 : 15-27. In the 72d Psalm, for example, the everlasting continuance of the sun and moon is taken for granted by the prophet, and the glory of Messiah the King, as well as the happiness of the righteous, is compared with the duration of these luminaries of our system, 5 : 7, 17. If they, then, are to be blotted out of existence, Christ and his people may be so too. But the prophet, in this Psalm, not only predicts Christ's eternal glory, and all nations as then blessed in him, but declares that the earth is to be the place where his dominion is to be established, and his name (fame or glory,) to be everlastingly perpetuated. 8-11 vs., 17 v.

But in this epistle we are taught by the apostle that our world, in its renovated form or condition, is to be the abode of the righteous, when Christ comes to destroy false teachers and scoffers, and to introduce the saints into his everlasting kingdom. Rev. 11 : 15 ; Dan. 2 : 44 ; 7 : 27. For our blessed Saviour is to sit at the right hand of the Father only until all his enemies have become his footstool ; and when they are destroyed, he will give up the vice-royalty of the Universe to the Father, and reign for ever and ever on earth. Ps. 110 : 1, with 1 Cor. 15 : 24. (See on 1 : 11.) For who can dream that the saints will have their everlasting home on earth, and their Redeemer and Lord be somewhere else in the universe ? Col. 3 : 4 ; 1 John 3 : 2. And yet Barnes informs us that nothing is said by Peter of such a personal reign of Christ ! When our Saviour comes the second time to our world, he will bring all the saints from heaven with him to the earth, 1 Thess. 3 : 13. (Zech. 14 : 5.) That is, he will bring

their disembodied spirits, (Enoch and Elijah excepted who have bodies,) with him, and unite them to their glorified bodies, 1 Thess. 4: 16; Phil. 3: 20, 21. The saints then living shall be changed from mortal to immortal in a moment, 1 Cor. 15: 51-53. But where, in any part of the New Testament, is it said that Christ, with his people, shall ever leave the earth? On the contrary *it is said* that the dominion of the earth shall be His, and that he shall reign here for ever and ever.

That the earth, in its future renovated condition is to be the place of Christ's everlasting kingdom, is declared also in Heb. 1. "But when he shall again have brought in the first begotten into the habitable earth, he says: and let all the angels of God worship him: ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εισαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτόγονον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην. (The position of πάλιν shows that it modifies εισαγάγῃ; which is confirmed by 5 v.; for there καὶ πάλιν not only precedes the quotation, but stands isolated. If the order had been πάλιν δὲ ὅταν, etc., then the common version could be justified; as it is, the marginal translation is alone correct.) Here *the Lord*, or *king* is mentioned, "the first begotten;" compare Rom. 8: 29; Col. 1: 15, 18; Rev. 1: 5; *the time*, "when he shall *again* have brought in;" at his second coming: *the place*, "the habitable earth:" compare 2: 5-8. In the preceding context the Lord or King is more particularly described as God's Son, or God in flesh, 5 v. with Ps. 2. The quotation contained in this sixth verse is taken from Ps. 97: 7, according to the LXX.; which Psalm describes the reign of Jehovah-Jesus in our world, after the destruction of his enemies. In the eighth verse, his kingdom on earth is declared to be everlasting: "*But to the Son*, (he says,) Thy Throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." Throne and sceptre are used, by metonymy, for the signs or outward indications of his presence as King of the earth. These words are taken from Ps. 45: 6. In 10-12 vs., our world, as renovated is particularly mentioned as the scene of our Lord's reign. "*And* (to the Son he says:)

Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall become old as a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." (Compare Heb. 13: 8.) These words are taken from Ps. 102: 25, 27. Our world will be changed for the better, be furnished with a holyday suit, so that thus even dumb nature will welcome our Lord. (The sacred writer, in Heb. 1, shows that Jesus Christ, God-Man, is far superior to the angels, first, because as Creator and Upholder of the universe, he is its rightful Lord, and as the Redeemer of lost men justly sits at the Father's right hand, (2: 3;) and, next, because as God-Man Mediator he is to be "the Lord of the whole earth," 4-12. Comp. 2: 5.) See also Matt. 19: 28; Acts 3: 19-21.

B. C. G. K. have *κατα το επαγγελμα. και τα επαγγεληματα; και ην* is found in the Vulgate, Æthiopic and Syriac versions. A. C. have *και ην*: in reference to this reading as found in A., T. Smith says; "scriptura non inusita: utpote simplice vocali pro dipthongo posita: quod millies factum, hujus venerandi codicis membranas volvendo, observavi." Tischendorf: p. XXXVIII. "*αι* eum ε confusum, quo nihil frequentius:" ita cismus (*ιωταζισμ* ὄζ.)

¹⁴Wherefore, beloved, since ye are looking for these things, hasten that ye may be found by him in peace, spotless and blameless; ¹⁵and think that the long suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, wrote unto you; ¹⁶he also (he wrote) in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things in which are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unestablished wrest, as also (they wrest) the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. ¹⁷Ye therefore, beloved, since ye know (these things) beforehand, be on your guard lest, hurried away by the error of the lawless, ye fall from your own steadfastness; ¹⁸but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be the glory, both now and to the day of eternity.

V. 14. *Wherefore, beloved, since ye are looking for these things.* The participle again expresses a reason, *προσχωτωντες*.

These things, τὰ αὐτὰ, that is an eternal residence with Christ at his coming in our world, purified and renewed, 10–13 vs., 4 v.; not, “such things,” the Greek for which is τοιαῦτα, as in Rom. 1: 32. 2: 2, and often elsewhere. *Hasten*, be in earnest, use the utmost diligence, or run in the way of holiness. Compare 1: 10, 15. *That ye may be found by him in peace, spotless and blameless*; that ye may, at his arrival, be discovered and acknowledged by Christ as his friends, and not be blamed by him: or, use your utmost efforts so to live as not to be made ashamed by being separated from Christ at his coming. (1 John 2: 28; καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Compare 2 Thess. 1: 9.) “That the testing of your faith *may be found* ending in praise, and honor, and glory, *at the revelation of Jesus Christ*,” 1 Pet. 1: 7. “And he that believeth on Him shall not at all be made ashamed,” 1 Pet. 2: 6. Compare Matt. 7: 23. *In peace*, means in a State of reconciliation; or as his friends, (John 15: 14,) who have obeyed his commands. *Blameless*, ἀμώμητοι—unblamed, i. e. by Him; blameless, or without blemish. (Compare 1 Pet. 1: 19; 2 Pet 2: 13, Gr.) Eph. 5: 27; 1 John 3: 2, 3. (‘Hasten to be found,’ σπουδάσατε εὐρεθῆναι, is equivalent to ‘Hasten that ye may be found;’ make haste to obey Jesus our Lord, that, when he comes, you may be found as indeed his friends. Εἰρήνη, see 1 Pet. 3: 11; Heb. 11: 31; 12: 14; Luke 14: 32.)

V. 15. *And think that the long suffering of our Lord is salvation*; think it not slowness or delay, as scoffers do, (9 v.,) but the cause, or primal spring, of your salvation. Salvation means complete deliverance from all evils, at our Lord’s coming. Compare 1 Pet. 1 5–10, 13. The effect, salvation is put by metonymy for the cause. See Ex. 15: 2; Ps. 27: 1; Acts 4: 12. There Peter says, “Neither is there *salvation* in any other;” only in him can be found its cause, he alone is the author of it. Heb. 5: 9, αἴτιος. Compare 2 Tim. 1: 4, to which Peter alludes. *Our Lord*, that is Jesus Christ, the Lord and Saviour, whose coming is all along spoken of, 3: 2, 4, 9, 10, 18. *Even as our beloved*

brother Paul, according to the wisdom given him, wrote unto you: now, Paul wrote to the churches of Galatia, to Ephesians and Colossians, living in Asia Minor; to say nothing of his epistles to Timothy, sent to Ephesus, for these are official letters; or, that to Philemon, which is a private letter to a friend in Colosse. And Peter wrote to Christians living in Asia Minor: so that what he here says is altogether accurate, and hence he justly called Paul and himself “your apostles,” 3: 2. *The wisdom given Paul*, or divinely bestowed on him, means his inspiration; or that comprehensive and profound knowledge of the Gospel, that accurate understanding of the plan of salvation and of the purposes of the Saviour, which was imparted to him by the Spirit of Christ. The apostle thus alludes to Eph. 3: 52. Compare Eph. 1: 8-10; Gal. 1: 12; 1 Cor. 12: 8. ‘Paul wrote to you, Christians in Asia Minor, by divine inspiration.’ By calling Paul his *beloved brother*, he alludes to Gal. 2: 9; 11: 12. Thus, in the most artless manner, he shows that his heart was free from envy, false ambition, and belittling pride, or that he had not a particle of the spirit of a Pope; and that he was manly enough to forgive a pungent and public reproof, when he had been blamed at Antioch, and that justly.

V. 16. *As also* (he wrote) *in all his epistles*; ὡς (ἐν πάσι) ἐν, etc.: so below, “As also (they wrest,) the other Scriptures.” ‘Paul also wrote all those epistles, which are not directly and originally addressed to Christians in Asia Minor, in the same way as those addressed to you, viz., by the wisdom given him.’ *Speaking in them*, ἐν αὐταῖς, i. e., in the epistles not originally directed to you; *of these things*, or the leading subjects of this epistle. See 1 and 2 Thess.; Rom. 2: 6-16; 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10; 15: 23-28; Rom. 8: 18-23; Phil. 2: 16; 3: 17-21. *In which are some things hard to be understood*, or not easy to be interpreted. *Not all, but some*; *not impossible* to be understood and explained, but *difficult*. And these things or topics relate not to the mode of a sinner’s acceptance with God, or his duty or the cer-

tainty of an unspeakably great and glorious reward at Christ's coming to those who truly trust in, love and obey him; but to other topics. C. G. K. have ἐν αἷς=in which things, or among which subjects: A. B., ἐν αἰς,=in which epistles. The former is edited by Tischendorf, Bengel, Bloomfield, Griesbach, and Hahn; the latter by Lachmann. We consider the former genuine. 'In which things or subjects there are some topics introduced hard to be understood:' *e. g.*, 1 Cor. 15: 23-28. These difficult passages in Paul's epistles relate not to the decrees of God, as Benson and Scott suppose; but more particularly to the *order of succession* of the events that are to precede, accompany, and follow Christ's coming. Herein there are difficulties, not only in Paul, but in Peter, and in the prophets. The *more haste* one makes in these matters, the less speed, or true progress. In our judgment, the great leading facts stand out prominently on the prophetical and apostolical paintings, or descriptions of the great day; to *group them* in the right order is indeed difficult, but the apostle does not say, impossible. Herein a very careful collation of parallel prophecies is necessary, together with long-continued and patient attention, and fervent prayer. Compare 1 Pet. 1: 10-12. And they to whom our Lord gives leisure, and who are set apart to study and explain his oracles, should, in an especial manner, thus give heed to the prophetic word, and apostolical scriptures. These stars in Christ's right hand should, after careful preparation, give light to the disciples in his house in reference to the coming of Christ as King and Judge, Rev. 1: 5, 7; 16: 20. For *many* of the things connected in Scripture with our Lord's advent are *easy to be understood*—if we come to "the word of Christ" with a child-like disposition, or a desire to learn. 'To test human systems of divinity by the infallible rule, can never be out of place; and in no particular do such systems need remodelling more than in eschatology, or the doctrine of the last things.

Which the unlearned and unestablished wrest: which things,

αἱ, which difficult subjects. *The unlearned*, *i. e.*, in these matters, unlearned in scriptural and apostolical prophecy, and especially as to our Lord's advent. Benson, McKnight and Doddridge translate *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς* "the unteachable;" but it properly means the untaught, the unlearned. The *unestablished*, *ἀστέγιστοι*, are those not confined or fixed in the love of holiness, as in 2: 14. Such persons avail themselves of these difficult subjects for sinister purposes; they *wrest* or *torture* them: *i. e.*, they put such passages on the rack of their intellect, not to find out or explain the truths contained in them, but to make them express what they wish. *As also* (they torture) *the other Scriptures*: they treat not only these difficult subjects in this way, but also the rest of the Scriptures in the same manner. Here Peter classes Paul's epistles with the Scriptures, because inspired or written with the wisdom given him; and he does so on a very suitable occasion, when near death; and when predicting the destructive errors and conduct of false teachers and scoffers. But this violent and wilful perversion of the meaning of Scripture, whether relating to Christ's advent and topics connected with it, or to other matters revealed by the Spirit of truth, is a very sinful and dangerous business, and, if persisted in, will lead to the *destruction* of those engaged in it. (See on 2: 1, *ἀπώλεια*.)

V. 17. *Ye therefore, beloved, since ye know* (these things) *beforehand*; that is, since ye have the knowledge furnished you by this epistle of the characteristics, conduct and doom of false teachers and scoffers: *Be on your guard*, watch yourselves; *i. e.*, beware of their arts, *φυλάσσεσθε*. Take care that you do not *fall from your steadfastness*: (compare 1: 12,) or, beware that you do not loose your convictions and firm persuasion of the necessity of truth and holiness on your part for a residence in our renovated world, in Christ's everlasting kingdom. Be on your guard lest, *hurried away by the errors of the lawless*, ye fall from, etc., *τῇ τῶν ἀθεσμων πλυνῇ συναπαχθεῖς*: led away, driven, or hurried along with others, is what is expressed by the parti-

ciple; like a heedless bystander in and by a crowd. The reference is to a sudden and temporary wavering of behavior, such as Peter himself and Barnabas exhibited at Antioch. (Compare Gal. 2: 13, Gr., to which Peter here alludes.) Benson and Bloomfield think the metaphor is derived from a torrent; but this view is not so probable as the one just given. *The error* (theoretical and practical) *of the lawless*, means their wandering from truth and holiness. The false teachers and scoffers, are here denoted by "the lawless."


V. 18. *But grow in grace*: grace by metonymy, for gracious endowments or virtues, the cause for the effect. *Grow* in grace, that is, desire and endeavor so to do; comp. 1: 5. *Add* to your faith, boldness," etc. *And in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, i. e.*, in the Holy Scriptures, the great subject of which is Christ considered as Saviour and Lord: *knowledge*, by metonymy, for the source of it, or the means by which it is acquired. See John 5: 39. Here we should observe that there can be no increase in holiness without growth in truth; and truth relating to our Lord's kingly, as well as his prophetic and priestly office. The divine word is not only the instrumental cause of our regeneration, (1 Pet. 1: 23,) but also, of our progressive sanctification; for we *grow thereby unto salvation*, 1 Pet. 2: 2. (Another undesigned allusion to, or coincidence with, his first epistle.)

To him, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, *be the glory both now, and to the day of eternity*. Here Peter adores Jesus Christ as truly God, as God in flesh; as the great author of our present holiness and future bliss; as of right deserving our present worship, and our eternal adoration: which false teachers, ancient and modern, refuse to teach or do.

What praises will fall from our lips, what warm and ever-glowing love will be in our hearts, when we see him as he is, and are like him in body and mind; when we inhabit our world, wholly freed from the curse of the fall; where there shall be no tempter, no

false teachers nor scoffers; no sickness nor death; where we shall obtain joy and gladness unspeakable, and eternity be the day in which we will serve Christ and triumph in him, enjoying our inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that cannot fade! "He who testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. So be it. Come, Lord Jesus." Rev. 22: 20.

That the apostles and primitive disciples expected with earnest desire the coming and kingdom of our Lord; that these things were the great objects of their hope, and the most powerful and exhilarating motives inciting them to duty, and enabling them to rejoice amidst manifold trials, is evident, not only from this epistle, but from clear and emphatic declarations in other parts of the New Testament. As specimens, see 1 Pet. 1: 6-13; 4: 12, 13; 5: 1-4; Jas. 5: 7, 8; 2: 5; 1: 12; 1 John 3: 1-3; 1 Cor. 1: 7-9; Col. 3: 1-4; Tit. 2: 11-14; 1 and 2 Thess., throughout; Rom. 8: 16-23. But now, how many disciples of Christ live in bondage through fear of death; as if he had not died to deliver them from it; as if he were not coming to complete their salvation in soul and body! Heb. 2: 14, 15; 9: 28. Surely, the apostolic and primitive type of piety can never be reformed by substituting for it the fear of death.

And "Satan," says Calvin, "aims right at the throat of the church, when he attempts to overthrow our faith in Christ's advent." Let it, therefore, be our highest ambition and daily business to promote his glory now, in propagating the gospel, and in every good word and work; and, to be found by him in peace, spotless and blameless, when he comes, according to his promise, to renovate our world as the eternal home of the righteous. 

Date Due

[illegible]



BS2795 .D372 c.2
A commentary on the Second epistle of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00084 7576